

U.S. Department of Transportation

Federal Highway Administration

THE STATUS OF THE NATION'S HIGHWAY BRIDGES: HIGHWAY BRIDGES: HIGHWAY BRIDGE REPLACEMENT AND REHABBLITAMION PROGRAM AND NATIONAL BRIDGE INVENTORY

THIRTEENIH REPORT TO THE UNITED STATES CONGRESS

**MAY 1997** 

·	·		

# THE STATUS OF THE NATION'S HIGHWAY BRIDGES: HIGHWAY BRIDGES: HIGHWAY BRIDGE REPLACEMENT AND REHABILITATION PROGRAM AND NATIONAL BRIDGE INVENTORY

# THIRTEENTH REPORT TO THE UNITED STATES CONGRESS

**MAY 1997** 

## Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Report Objectives	1
The Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991	1
Chapter 1: The Highway Bridge Replacement and Rehabilitation Program	5
Funding	5
Eligibility	8
Apportioned Funds	11
Indian Reservation Bridges	13
Transferability of Bridge Apportionments	14
Discretionary Bridge Program	15
Timber Bridge Construction Grant Program	1s
Acceleration of Bridge Projects	20
Chapter 2: The National Bridge Inventory	22
National Bridge Inspection Standards	22
Inspection Procedures	25
Inspection Frequency	2s
Inspection Report and Inventory	29
Deficient Bridges	32
Load Posted Bridges	34
Exhibits:	E-1

# List of Exhibits

Chapter 1: The	Highway Bridge Replacement and Rehabilitation Program	<b>Page</b>
Exhibit 1-1	Funding - Pre-ISTEA Deductions	E-1
Exhibit 1-2	Funding - ISTEA Deductions	E-2
Exhibit 1-3	Eligibility - Funded Bridges	E-3
Exhibit 1-4	Apportioned Funds - Bridge Construction Unit Costs	E-4
Exhibit 1-5	State <b>HBRRP</b> Apportionments: 1992-1996	E-5
Exhibit 1-6	Total HEXERP Apportionments and Obligations	E-6
Exhibit 1-7	Indian Reservation Bridges	E-12
Exhibit 1-S	Transferability of Bridge Apportionments	E-13
Exhibit 1-9	Discretionary Bridge Program - Appropriations	E-14
Exhibit 1-10	Discretionary Bridge Program - Funds	E-15
Exhibit l-1 1	Discretionary Bridge Program - Projects	E-16
Exhibit 1-12	Timber Bridge Construction Grant Program	E-19
Exhibit 1-13	Timber Bridge Construction Grant Program: FY 1992-1996	E-20
Exhibit 1-14	Timber Bridge Construction Grant Program - FY 1992 Allocations	E-21
Exhibit 1-15	Timber Bridge Construction Grant Program - FY 1993 Allocations	E-22
Exhibit 1-16	<b>Timber</b> Bridge Construction Grant Program - FY 1994 Allocations	E-23
Exhibit 1-17	Timber Bridge Construction Grant Program - FY 1995 Allocations	E-24
Exhibit 1-18	Timber Bridge Construction Grant Program - FY 1996 Allocations	E-25
Exhibit 1-19	Acceleration of Bridge Projects	E-26
Chapter 2: The	National Bridge Inventory	
Exhibit 2-1	National Bridge Inventory - National Bridge Inspection Standards	E-27
Exhibit 2-2	Inspection Frequency - National Highway System	E-28
Exhibit 2-3	Inspection Frequency - Other Federal-Aid Highways	E-29
Exhibit 2-4	Inspection Frequency - Non Federal-Aid Highways	E-30

Exhibit 2-5	Count of Deficient Bridges By State - NHS	E-3 1
Exhibit <b>2-6</b>	Count of Deficient Bridges By State - Other Federal-Aid Hi&ways	E-32
Exhibit 2-7	Count of Deficient Bridges By State - Non Federal-Aid Highways	E-33
Exhibit 2-8	Status of Bridges Approved for the Bridge Program	E-34
Exhibit 2-9	Deficient Bridges - Comparison	E-35
Exhibit <b>Z-10</b>	Count of Open, Closed and Posted Bridges - NHS	E-36
Exhibit <b>2-11</b>	Count of Open, Closed and Posted Bridges - Other Federal-Aid Highways	E-37
Exhibit 2-12	Count of Open, Closed and Posted Bridges - Non Federal-Aid Highways	s E-38

### **List of Acronyms**

**AASSITIO** American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials

BIA Bureau of Indian **Affairs** 

CFR Code of Federal Regulations

CMA Calcium Magnesium Acetate

DBP Discretionary Bridge Program

FHWA Federal **Highway** Administration

FO Functionally Obsolete

FY Fiscal Year

**IRRs** Indian Reservation Roads

**ISTEA** Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act Of 199 1

HBRRP Highway Bridge Replacement and Rehabilitation Program

NBI National Bridge Inventory

**NBIP** National Bridge Inspection Program

**NBIS** National Bridge Inspection Standards

**NEIS** National Highway System

. NHSDA National Highway System Designation Act of 1995

PL Public Law

SBRP Special Bridge Replacement Program

SD Structurally Deficient

SHA State Hi&way Agency

SR **Sufficiency** Rating

**STAA** Surface Transportation Assistance Act

**STP** Surface Transportation Program

**STURAA** Surface Transportation and Unifiorm Relocation Assistance Act of 1987

**TBCGP.** Timber Bridge Construction Grant Program

TIP Transportation Improvement Plan

USC United States Code

#### INTRODUCTION

#### REPORT OBJECTIVES

Title 23, U.K., Section 144(i), requires the Secretary of Transportation to report to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives on projects approved under the Highway Bridge Replacement and Rehabilitation Program (HBRRP). A second requirement is that the Secretary annually revise the National Bridge Inventory (NBI) and report the findings to these committees. This thirteenth report to Congress provides an appraisal of the administration of the HBRRP and the NBI through fiscal year (FY) 1996.

#### THE INTERMODAL SURFACE TRANSPORTATION EFFICIENCY ACT OF 1991

Signed into law on December 18, 1991, the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (ISTEA) provides authorizations for highways, highway safety, and mass transportation for FY 1992 through FY 1997. ISTEA serves to develop a National Intermodal Transportation System that is economically efficient, environmentally sound, provides the foundation for the Nation to compete in the global economy and that will move people and goods in an energy efficient manner.

For the past 25 years, the Federal-aid Highway Program was directed primarily toward the construction and improvement of four Federal-aid systems--Interstate, Primary, Secondary, and Urban--which constituted more than 1.3 million kilometers of the **6.3** million kilometers of roads in the United States. Now, instead of four Federal-aid systems, there are two:

- the National Highway System (NHS), and
- the Interstate System, which is a component of the **MHS**.

The **NHS** provides an interconnected system of principal arterial routes which will serve major population centers, international border crossings, ports, airports, public transportation facilities, and other intermodal transportation facilities and other major travel destinations; meet national defense requirements; and serve interstate and interregional travel. By focusing Federal resources on these most important roads, we will improve our strategic investment in transportation.

**ISTEA** also created the Surface Transportation Program (STP), a block grant type program that may be used by the States and localities for any roads (including **NHS**) that are not functionally classified as local or rural minor collectors. These roads are now collectively referred to as Federal-aid roads. Bridge projects paid for with STP funds are not restricted to Federal-aid roads but may be on any public road.

Although the **term** "off-system" remains in **ISTEA** provisions, it is more appropriate to call these "roads other than Federal-aid highways", which can be further defined as those with a **functional** classification of local roads or rural minor collectors.

Section 1016 of **ISTEA** allows State highway agencies **(SHA's)** to exempt certain Federal-aid projects **from** the **FHWA's** approval of plans, specifications, and estimates, and construction

oversight. For non-NHS projects, **SHA's** may design and construct projects according to State laws, standards, and procedures, rather than Federally approved procedures and standards.

**ISTEA** authorized \$16.1 billion over a period of 6 years for the HBRRP: \$2.288 billion for FY 1992, \$2.762 billion for FY 1993, \$2.762 billion for FY 1994, \$2.762 billion for FY 1995, \$2.763 billion for FY 1996, and \$2.763 billion for FY 1997.

**ISTEA** allows Federal participation in bridge painting, seismic retrofitting, and the application-of calcium magnesium acetate (noncorrosive deicing salt) to highway **bridges**. These items of work are also now eligible for participation with HBRRP funds on deficient bridges. In March, 1994, the President signed a bill (enacted into law as Pub. L. 103-220) permitting **HBRRP** funds to be used to seismic retrofit non-deficient as well as deficient bridges.

New requirements have been established concerning bridges on Indian reservations. The legislation requires that the Secretary of Transportation, in consultation with the Secretary of the Interior, inventory all bridges on Indian reservation and park roads. For each fiscal year, not less than 1 percent of HBRRP **funds** apportioned to each State that has an Indian reservation within its boundaries shall be expended for projects to replace, rehabilitate, paint, or apply calcium magnesium acetate (CMA) to highway bridges located on Indian reservation roads **(IRRs)**.

ISTEA also continues to fund high-cost bridge projects through the Discretionary Bridge

Program (DBP), although at a much reduced flinding level—from approximately \$225 million per
year to approximately \$68 million per year. From this program, a portion of funding is set-aside
to carry out a Timber Bridge Research and Demonstration Program that will make new
information and technology on timber bridges available to transportation agencies. The
construction grant portion of the "timber bridge" program applies to the construction of timber
bridge projects at a funding level of \$7 million for FY 1992 and \$7.5 million annually from
FY 1993 through FY 1997. The research portion of the program is funded at \$1 million annually.

Provisions have been included in **ISTEA** to allow States to transfer up to 40 percent of the **HBIRIP funds** to the NHS or STP programs. Section 302 of the National Highway System Designation Act. of 1995 **(NHSDA)** increased the amount to 50 percent.

This report focuses on the major provisions of the current highway bridge program.

#### CHAPTER 1

#### THE HIGHWAY BRIDGE REPLACEMENT

#### AND REHABILITATION PROGRAMI

#### **FUNDING**

In 1978, the 95th Congress legislated one of the largest bridge replacement and rehabilitation programs the Nation had ever known. The 1978 Surface Transportation Assistance Act (STAA) replaced the then existing Special Bridge Replacement Program (SBRP) with the HBRRP.

By enacting this legislation, Congress declared it to be in the vital interest of the Nation that a highway bridge replacement and rehabilitation program be established to enable **SHA's** to replace or rehabilitate highway bridges over **waterways**, other topographical barriers, other highways, or railroads when a SHA and the Secretary determine that a bridge is significantly import&t and is unsafe because of structural deficiencies, physical deterioration, or functional obsolescence.

The 1978 **STAA** authorized a total of \$4.2 billion for **FYs** 1979 through 1982 to improve bridges on public roads throughout the Nation:

- FY 1979 \$ **.900** billion
- FY 1980 1.1000 billion
- FY 1981 1.300 billion
- FY 1982 .**-900** billion

5

At least 15 percent of HBRRP funds were to be used for bridges on public roads other than those on Federal-aid highways and this percentage could be increased to 35 percent at a State's discretion.

Funding for the HBRRP is divided into apportioned funds that are distributed according to relative State needs and discretionary **funds** that are set-aside for allocation by the Secretary. The **maximum** Federal share is SO percent of eligible project costs. Various amounts of the **HBRRP** funds are required to be deducted before apportionments are made to the States. Funds are deducted for the purposes of administering the provisions of Title 23, U.S.C., and other bridge related programs.

The 1982 **STAA** (**P.L.** 97-424) continued the HBRRP at record funding levels by authorizing a total of \$7.05 billion for **FYs** 1983 through 1986. This total was reduced by \$0.150 billion in FY 1986 to \$6.9 billion as a result **of the** Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985 (**P**:**L**. 99-272):

- FY 1983 \$1.600 billion
- FY 1984 1.650 billion
- FY 1985 1.750 billion
- FY 1986 2.050 billion less \$0.150 billion

The 1987 Surface Transportation and **Uniform** Relocation Assistance Act **(STURAA) (P.L.** 100-17) extended the HBRRP by authorizing \$8.15 billion for **FYs** 1987 through 1991.

This amount was reduced to approximately \$8.13 billion by the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1989 (P.L. 101-239) which caused a reduction in 1990 of \$18,872,674:

- FY 1987 \$1.630 billion
- FY **1988** 1.630 billion
- FY 1989 1.630 billion
- FY 1990 1.630 billion less \$0.019 billion
- FY 1991 1,630 billion

The 1991 **ISTEA** again extended the **HBRRP** by authorizing \$16.1 billion over a period of 6 years. However, Section **1028(g)** of the **ISTEA** allows States to transfer up to 40 percent (later revised to **50** percent) of their annual **HBRRP** apportionment to the **NHS** or **STP**.. (Please refer to the section in this chapter on **Transferability** of Bridge Apportionments). **ISTEA fluiding** is summarized in the Introduction to this report.

Exhibit 1-1 displays **HBRRP** authorized **funding-pre-ISTEA** deductions. Exhibit 1-2 displays **HERRP** authorized **funding-ISTEA** deductions. The FY 1996 authorization was reduced **from** \$2.763 billion by an estimated 13.14 percent to comply with Section 1003(c) of P.L. 102-240.

#### ELIGIBILITY

The 1978 STAA established the HBRRP to aid the States in an effort to alleviate the recognized nationwide bridge problem. Revisions to existing regulations were required to accommodate the new bridge program. Final revised regulations for the **HBRRP** were published in the December 13, 1979, Federal Register.

Under current regulations, the States may replace or rehabilitate eligible highway bridges over waterways, other topographical barriers, other highways, or railroads when the States and the Secretary finds that a bridge is significantly important and is unsafe because of structural deficiencies, physical deterioration, or functional obsolescence.

Deficient **highway** bridges on all public roads may be eligible for replacement or rehabilitation.

The following types of work are eligible for participation under the **HIBRRY**:

- 1. Replacement Total replacement of a structurally deficient or functionally obsolete bridge with a new facility constructed in the same general **traffic** corridor. A nominal **amount** of approach work, **stifficient** to connect the new facility to the existing roadway or to return the gradeline to an attainable touchdown point in accordance with good design practice is also eligible.
- 2. <u>Rehabilitation</u> The project requirements necessary to **perform** the major work required to restore the structural integrity of a bridge as well as work necessary to correct major **safety** defects are eligible.

The costs of long approach fills, causeways, connecting roadways, interchanges, ramps, and other extensive earth structures, when constructed beyond the **attainable** touchdown point, are not eligible under the HBRRP.

Under the **HBRRP**, whenever a deficient bridge is replaced or its deficiency alleviated by a new bridge, the deficient bridge must be either dismantled (or demolished) or its use limited to the type and volume of **traffic** the structure can safely service over its remaining fife,

Federal regulations originating with Section 123(e) of the 1987 **STURA&**; permit the expenditure of local funds on an off-system non-Federal-aid project in some cases to be used to offset the local matching share of a subsequent HBRRP bridge project. Also, these same regulations permit States to carry out bridge improvements on non-controversial off-system bridges (on local roads and rural minor collectors) without Federal funding, and then apply 80 percent of the cost of such projects as credit toward the non-Federal share of other HBRRP projects.

Federal regulations originating with Section 123(d) of the 1987 **STURAA** make the replacement of destroyed bridges and ferryboat service eligible work under the **HBRRP**. These regulations also allow a State to use **HBRRP** funds to replace any low-water crossing regardless of the length of such low-water crossing. However, low-water crossings are not to be added to the NBI nor are they considered as bridge needs.

Also, Section **1028(b)** of **ISTEA** allows HBRRP funds to be used for bridge painting, seismic retrofitting, and **CMA** applications. A State may seismically retrofit a bridge with **HBRRP** funds without regard to whether the bridge is eligible for replacement or rehabilitation.

The **NBI** is used for preparing the HBRRP selection list of bridges both on and off of Federal-aid highways. There are two types of deficient bridges, structurally deficient (SD) and functionally obsolete **(FO)**. An SD bridge, as defined by the FHWA., is one that (1) has been restricted to light vehicles only, (2) is closed, or (3) requires immediate rehabilitation to remain open. An FO bridge is one in which the deck geometry, load carrying capacity (comparison of the original design load to the State legal load), clearance, or approach roadway alignment no longer meets the usual criteria for the system of which it is an integral part.

The **sufficiency** rating (SR) is the basis for establishing eligibility and priority for replacement and rehabilitation of bridges. In general, the lower the **SR**, the higher the priority. An SR is a numerical rating of a bridge based on its structural adequacy and safety, essentiality for public use, and its serviceability and functional obsolescence. Bridges considered SD or FO are included on selection lists. Those bridges appearing on the list with an SR less than 50 are eligible for replacement or rehabilitation, while those with an SR of SO or less are eligible for rehabilitation. An SR of 100 percent would represent an entirely sufficient bridge and 0 percent would represent an entirely **insufficient** or deficient bridge.

Exhibit 1-3 displays the total number of bridges funded under the HBRRP.

#### **APPORTIONED FUNDS**

Title 23, **U.S.C.**, Section 144(e), specifies that: "Funds authorized to carry out this section shall be apportioned among the several states on October 1 of the fiscal year for which authorizedin accordance with this subsection. Each deficient bridge shall be placed into one of the following categories: (1) Federal-aid system bridges eligible for replacement, (2) Federal-aid system bridges eligible for rehabilitation, (3) off-system bridges eligible for replacement, and (4) off-system bridges eligible for rehabilitation. The square footage of deficient bridges in each category shall be multiplied by the respective unit price on a State-by-State basis, as determined by the Secretary; and the total cost in each State divided by the total cost of the deficient bridges in all States shah determine the apportionment factors. For purposes of the preceding sentence, the total cost of deficient bridges in a State and in all States shall be reduced by the total cost of any highway bridges constructed under subsection (m) in such State, relating to replacement of destroyed bridges and ferryboat services. No State shah receive more than 10 per centum or less than 0.25 per centum of the total apportionment for any one fiscal year. The Secretary shall make these determinations based upon the latest available data, which shall be updated annually. Funds apportioned under this section shall be available for expenditure for the same period as funds apportioned for projects on the Federal-aid primary system under this title. Any funds not obligated at the expiration of such period shall be reapportioned by the Secretary to the other States in accordance with this subsection. The use of funds authorized under this section to carry out a project for the seismic retrofit of a bridge shah not **affect** the apportionment of funds under this section".

As required by Title 23, U.S.C., Section 144, the **PAWA** revises each State's apportionment factor annually to reflect changing needs and actual construction costs. To establish the apportionment factor, the **FHWA** applies construction unit costs to the four categories of eligible deficient bridge projects in each State. These categories are: (1) replacement of Federal-aid system bridges, (2) replacement of off-system bridges, (3) rehabilitation of Federal-aid system bridges, and (4) rehabilitation of off-system bridges. The apportionment factor is the ratio of each State's needs compared with the national need. Pursuant to Title 23, USC., Section 144(e), each State must receive at least 0.25 percent, but no more than 10 percent, of the total funds apportioned for any one FY.

The HBRRP funds may be used for the following work items for bridges on-system and off-system:

- Replacing or rehabilitating deficient bridges,
- Inspecting, evaluating and inventorying bridges, and
- Painting, seismic retrofitting and applying CMA to deficient bridges. (Non-deficient bridges can also be seismically retrofitted).

Exhibit 1-4 displays the overall Federal-aid and non Federal-aid bridge construction unit costs for replacement between 1990 and 1995. Exhibit 1-5 displays the distribution of the **HEXRIP** apportioned funds by State for **FYs** 1992 through 1996. **Exhibit** 1-6 displays total **HEXRIP** apportionments and obligations through September 30, 1996, for the 65 percent portion

designated for Federal-aid bridges (on-system), the 15 percent portion designated for non Federal-aid bridges (off-system), and the 20 percent portion for either Federal-aid or non Federal-aid bridges (on/off), respectively.

#### INDIAN RESERVATION BRIDGES

The 1991 **ISTEA** established new requirements concerning Indian reservation bridges. The legislation requires that the Secretary of Transportation, in consultation with the Secretary of the Interior, inventory all bridges on Indian reservation roads **(TRE)**. The National Bridge Inspection Standards **(NBIS)** require the inspection of these bridges and the entry of the bridge records into the NBI.

**IRRs** are described in Title 23, U.S.C., Section 101, as public roads that are located within or provide access to an Indian reservation. **ISTEA** requires not less than 1 percent of the HBRRP apportionment due to each State that has an Indian reservation within its boundaries to be transferred to the Secretary of the Interior to carry out Title 23, U.K., Section 144(g)(4). These funds may be expended for eligible projects to replace, rehabilitate, paint or apply CMA to highway bridges located on **IRRs**. In addition to bridges under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Indian **Affairs (BIA)** within the Department of the Interior, there are also State, local and other federally owned bridges on these roads on which the finds may be used.

All bridges on **IRRs**, which include those roads leading to or through Indian reservations, have to be identified in the State bridge inventories and the NBI. Using an NBI based selection list, the

Department of the Interior through **BIA**, selects **BIA**, State, local or Federal bridge projects to fund on roads that meet the definition of **IRRs**. The 1 percent of a State's apportioned bridge funds transferred to the **BIA** are used for projects within that State.

The FHWA Federal Lands Highway Office transfers contract authority and a matching amount of obligation limitation to the BIA for expenditure on **IRR** bridges. Each year, the BIA is **required** to submit a Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP) for use of the 1 percent HBRRP funds. None of these 1 percent HBRRP funds can be obligated on projects in a State until there is an approved TIP for that State.

Exhibit 1-7 displays the history of funding by State for this program since its inception through September 30, 1996.

#### TRANSFERABILITY OF BRIDGE APPORTIONMENTS

The 1991 **ISTEA** established new requirements concerning the transferability of bridge apportionments. Section 104(g) of Title 23, U.S.C. was amended by inserting before the last sentence the following new sentences: "A State may transfer not to exceed 40 percent of the State's apportionment under section 144 in any fiscal year to the apportionment of such State under subsection (b)(1) or subsection (b)(3) of this section. Any transfer to subsection (b)(3) shall not be subject to section **133(d)**. Section 302 of the NHSDA (P.L. 104-59) increased the amount that can be transferred to 50 percent.

The transfer provision in **ISTEA** gave States more flexibility to apply Federal funds to a wide range of hi&way and bridge projects. A State may choose to transfer up to 50 percent of the HBRRP funds to the NHS or **STP** programs. The off-system portion of **HBRRP funds** may not be transferred because of the 15 percent off-system restriction. Once transferred, these funds are subject to NHS or STP eligibility requirements and not those of the **HBRRP**.

Exhibit 1-8 displays fund transfers **from** FY 1992 through FY 1996. Approximately \$1.639 billion has been transferred out of the HBRRP to the **NEIS** or **STP**. Of this amount, \$0.457 billion was transferred to the NHS and \$1.182 billion was transferred to the STP.

In addition, Section 350 of the NHSDA allows States to transfer up to 10 percent of their apportioned **HBRRP** funds for each of **FYs** 1996 and 1997 into the highway account of the infrastructure bank established by the State. During FY 1996, the following States transferred the amounts listed below:

Ohio	\$7,000,000
------	-------------

Oregon **\$2,971,189** 

Texas **\$9,006,903** 

\$18,978,092

#### **DISCRETIONARY BRIDGE PROGRAM.**

The 1978 STAA required that \$200 million annually be taken off the top of the **HBRRP** to establish a Discretionary Bridge Program (**DBP**) for the replacement or rehabilitation of high cost

Federal-aid system bridges. The 1982 STAA continued the program at the same annual funding level. The 1987 **STURIAM** again continued the program but increased the authorization to \$225 million. However, Section 149 of the **STURIAM** required that a portion of the discretionary bridge funds be set-aside to help pay for demonstration projects.

**ISTEA** also continued the program but at a greatly reduced funding level. A portion of these reduced **funds** were set-aside to **fund** a new timber bridge program (see the following section of this report on the Timber Bridge Construction Grant Program).

<u>Fiscal</u> <u>Year</u>	<u>Appropriation</u>	<u>Discretionary</u> <u>Bridge Program</u>	<u>Timber</u> <u>Bridge Program</u>
1992	\$57,000,000	\$49,000,000	\$8,000,000
1993	\$658,0000,0000	\$59,500,000	\$8,500,000
1994	\$68,000,000	\$59,500,000	\$8,500,000
1995	\$69,000,000	\$60,500,000	\$8,500,000
1996	\$69,000,000	<b>\$60,</b> 500,0 <b>00</b>	\$8,500,000
1997	\$69,000,000	\$60,500,000	\$8,500,000

#### DBP funds may only be used for:

1. The replacement or rehabilitation of an NHS or other Federal-aid highway bridge where the cost is more than \$10 million, or

2. An NHS or other Federal-aid highway bridge having a replacement or rehabilitation cost less than \$10 million but at least twice the amount of apportioned HBRRP funds to the State for the fiscal year in which application is made.

Each year, the States are requested to furnish applications for DBP funds to FHWA by July 1. The data submitted by the States is reviewed for accuracy. A rating factor is computed for each candidate. The rating factor is based on bridge characteristics listed in Section 161 of the 1982 **ST&A.** The rating factor formula was published in the November 17, 1983, Federal Register.

First priority is given to those bridges previously funded that need additional funds in the first 3 quarters of the fiscal year. Priority is then given to those unfunded bridge candidates with the lowest rating factors that need construction funds in the first 3 quarters of the fiscal year.

Unfunded new start candidate projects from States that have transferred funds **from** the **HBRRP** to the **NEIS** or STP (see the previous section on Transferability of Bridge Apportionments) during the previous fiscal year are not considered for DBP funding for the subsequent year. Also, for unfunded projects, funding of right-of-way acquisition is considered only **if the** State assures that construction will begin no later than the third quarter of the next fiscal year. Preliminary engineering is no longer an eligible item for DBP funds.

Exhibit 1-9 displays DBP appropriations and deductions by fiscal year. Exhibit **1-10** displays carryover amounts, allocations, and unallocated balances by fiscal year. Exhibit l-1 1 displays all projects that have received DBP funds and the fiscal year when funds were initially allocated.

Some of the projects displayed have received Federal funds from other sources in addition to State and local matching funds.

#### TIMBERBRIDGE **CONSTRUCTION** GRANT PROGRAM:

Section 1039 of **ISTEA** provides a program of research, technology transfer and construction grants for **timber** bridges. Selection and approval are based on the following criteria:

- (a) Bridge designs that have both initial and long-term structural and environmental integrity.
- **(b)** Bridge designs that utilize **timber** species native to the State or region.
- (c) Innovative bridge designs that have the possibility of increasing knowledge, cost effectiveness, and future use of such bridges.
- (d) Environmental practices for preservative-treated timber, and construction techniques that comply with all environmental regulations will be utilized.

Funding set-asides are shown below:

Fiscal Year	<b>Appropriation</b>	Construction Grants Research Grants		
1992	\$8,000,000	\$7,000,000	\$1,000,000	
1993	\$83,500,000	\$7,500,000	\$1,000,000	
1994	\$8,500,000	\$7,500,000	\$1,000,000	
1995	\$8,500,000	\$7,500,000	\$1,000,000	
1996	\$8,500,000	\$7,500,000	\$1,000,000	
1997	\$8,500,000	\$7,500,000	\$1,000,000	

Timber Bridge Construction Grant Program (TBCGP) funds may be used for the replacement or rehabilitation of any public road bridge. The new bridges are to be of structural **timber** regardless of the type of bridge being replaced or rehabilitated. The candidate structures must meet the eligibility criteria of the HBRRP.

Each year, the States are requested to furnish to **FHWA** by July 1 applications for TBCGP **funds**. The data submitted by the States is reviewed for accuracy. A rating factor is computed for each candidate. Timber bridges on the **NHS** are to meet applicable **AASHTO** Standard Specifications for **Highway** Bridges. Timber bridges on all other public roads are to be designed in accordance with individual State standards. Eligible costs are construction costs (including construction engineering) but preliminary engineering and right-of-way costs are to be excluded.

The rating factor is computed by a formula derived for the most part to take into account the above noted criteria set by Congress. The candidates are ranked in priority order (the lower the rating factor, the higher the priority for funding). Generally, the top ranked candidates **from** each **FHIWA** Region are funded until available funds are exhausted.

Exhibit 1-12 displays carryover amounts, allocations, and unallocated balances by fiscal year. Exhibit 1-13 displays fund allocations by Region and State. Exhibits 1-14 through 1-18 display fund allocations **from** FY 1992 through FY 1996.

#### **ACCELERATION OF BRIDGE PROJECTS**

Section 147 of the 1978 STAA (P-L. 95-599) directed the Secretary of Transportation to carry out two projects to demonstrate the feasibility of reducing the time required to replace unsafe bridges. The 1978 STAA set aside \$54 million for the two bridge projects. Congress designated the Portsmouth (U.S. Grant) Bridge, between Kentucky and Ohio, and the East Huntington Bridge, between West Virginia and Ohio, as likely candidates.

Section 15 of the 1978 **STAA** Amendments **(P-I)**, 96-106) revised Section 147 to set-aside **sufficient** resources from FY 1981 **HBRRP** funds to complete the two projects. Funds were made available until expended and were exempt **from** obligation limitations. Through the efforts of Federal and State personnel involved in the project, the total project cost of the Portsmouth Bridge was reduced significantly. As a result of this and conservative set-asides, \$98 million in excess funds became available.

Section 147 of the 1978 STAA was amended by Section 4105 of the Consolidated Omnibus Reconciliation Act of 1985 **(P.L.** 99-272). This amendment (Ohio River Bridge Fund Reprogramming) set-aside \$65 **million** of the excess funds to be used on 3 specific projects between Kentucky and Ohio: (1) Central Bridge at Cincinnati, Ohio; (2) Suspension Bridge at Cincinnati, Ohio; and (3) Maysville Bridge at Aberdeen, Ohio. In 1986, the remaining \$33 million of excess funds were apportioned to the States as **HBRRP** funds.

The Federal share was set at 90 percent. Concerning the Portsmouth Bridge and the East Huntington Bridge, Senate Report 96-333 included the view that necessary bridge approaches and connector roadways were eligible items.

Concerning the three Ohio River bridge projects, each project was required to utilize state-of-the-art technology and provide the best life-cycle costs. The Secretary of Transportation was required to give priority to completing the Central Bridge and the Suspension Bridge. **After** the Secretary certifies in writing that **sufficient funds** were reserved **from** the \$65 million to complete the Central Bridge and the Suspension Bridge, any remaining funds could be used on the Maysville Bridge.

The Conference report on the legislation further explains other issues including the following:

(1) reports are to be submitted **1**, **6**, 11 and 21 years after completion of the three projects; (2) if the \$65 million is not sufkient, the State will have to use other Federal and State funds available to it to make up any difference; (3) no additional special Federal funding will be provided for any of these bridges; and (4) the State must agree to complete the projects in the event the \$65 million is not **sufficient** to cover any cost overruns.

In 1995, the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet requested approval to change the order of **funding** for the Maysville Bridge due to controversies surrounding the Suspension (Roebling) Bridge. The FHWA consulted with the congressional committees and the State's request was approved. The available Section **147 funds** can be authorized for the Maysville Bridge construction project following normal Federal-aid procedures. A program funding history is displayed in Exhibit 1-19.

#### **CHAPTER 2**

#### THE NATIONAL BRIDGE INVENTORY

#### NATIONAL BRIDGE INSPECTION STANDARDS

Until the December 1967 collapse of the Silver Bridge over the Ohio River between West Virginia and Ohio, which resulted in 46 deaths, little support existed for an **NBI** and a national bridge inspection program in the United States. The public outcry and subsequent congressional hearings resulting from this tragedy clearly supported the need for a national program. The hearings demonstrated that many States were not sure how many bridges they owned, and others had no formalized inspection or related recordkeeping procedures.

As a result **sf** these hearings, Congress, in the 1968 Federal-Aid Highway Act, directed that the Secretary of Transportation shall "in consultation with the State highway departments and interested and knowledgeable private organizations and individuals...**establish** national bridge inspection **standards...for** the proper **safety** inspection of bridges on any of the Federal-Aid **highway** systems." The law required each State to maintain a current inventory of all bridges on the Federal-aid system.

In the 1970 Federal-Aid Highway Act, Congress directed the Secretary, in consultation with the States, to inventory all bridges on the Federal-Aid highway systems over waterways and other topographical barriers, **classify** them according to their serviceability, safety, and essentially for

public use; and assign each a priority for replacement. On April 27, 1971, the NBIS were issued to satisfy the mandate of Congress. By the end of 1973, most States had inventoried all bridges on the Federal-Aid highway systems.

In 1978, the STAA directed the Secretary of Transportation to extend the inventory and inspection program to include bridges on all public roads. The **NBIS** were revised on December 13, 1979, to comply with the new legislation.

The 1987 **STURAM** strengthened the congressional mandate for **the NBIS** by making the requirements a separate section of Title 23 (Title 23, **U.S.C.**, Section 151 -- National Bridge Inspection Program **(NBIP)**). The **NBIS** had previously been a part of Section 116, which dealt with maintenance.

The **NBIP** (1987 version) contains the following provisions:

- On Requires the Secretary to establish national bridge inspection standards for the proper safety inspection and evaluation of all highway bridges.
- (b) Minimum requirements of inspection standards:
  - (1) specify the method by which such inspections shall be **carried** out.
  - (2) establish the maximum time period between inspections.
  - (3) establish the qualifications for those charged with carrying out the inspections.
  - (4) require each State to maintain and make available to the Secretary:
    - (A) written bridge inspection reports.

- **(B)** current bridge inventory data.
- (5) establish a procedure for national certification of bridge inspectors.
- (c) Requires the Secretary to establish a program designed to train governmental employees to carry out bridge inspections.
- (d) The Secretary may use funds made available pursuant to the provisions of 23 U.S.C., Sections 104(a), 307(a) and 144 to **carry** out the above.

The current version of the NBIS became effective on October 25, 1988, and includes provisions for inspection procedures, **fkequency** of inspections, qualifications of personnel, inspection reports, and inventories.

The primary purpose of the **NBIS** is to locate, evaluate, and act on existing bridge deficiencies to assure that the bridges are safe for the traveling public. An evaluation of each bridge's load-carrying capacity is an essential part of the procedure. Appropriate action, by promptly posting or closing a bridge, is essential and required to alert motorists **of any** load **carrying** deficiencies.

The **FHWA**, in consultation with the States, establishes general bridge priorities by assigning an SR (described earlier in this report) from 0 to 100 to each bridge inventoried. The lower the **SR**, the higher the need for replacement or rehabilitation.

An SR is based on the following general categories and relative percentages:

55 percent - structural adequacy and **safety** 

30 percent - serviceability and functional obsolescence

15 percent - essentially for public use

-----

100 percent

The States' bridge inventory records are sent to the FHWA annually to update the **NBI**. Using the **NBI**, the FHWA compiles an **HBRRP** "selection list" for each State (Title 23, Code of Federal Regulations, Part 650.405). The list includes all deficient bridges with an SR of 80 or less. All of these bridges are eligible for rehabilitation. Bridges with an SR less than 50 are also eligible for replacement. The FHWA requires that the State consider all feasible alternatives, including rehabilitation, before replacing a bridge. Rehabilitation, where feasible and with exceptions, is usually less expensive than replacement.

The major provisions of the **NBIS** are summarized in Exhibit 2-1.

#### **INSPECTION PROCEDURES**

According to the **NBIS**, the owners of bridges on any public road are responsible for inspecting their bridges and for the cost of those inspections. The State is responsible for assuring that all inspections are completed within their State. **HBRRP funds** may be used to cover the cost of bridge inspections at the option of each State.

The NBIS inspection procedures require each highway department to assemble an organization capable of managing the bridge inspection program. The **bridge** inspectors must meet certain minimum qualifications. The FHWA offers several training courses to enable inspectors to meet the **NBIS** requirements. The training includes instructions on introductory and advanced bridge **safety** inspections, inspection of **fracture** critical members, nondestructive testing methods and other related topics.

Inspection records and bridge inventories are required to be prepared and maintained. Each structure must be rated according to its safe load carrying capacity, and each structure must be load posted if necessary.

The individual in charge of the organizational unit that has been delegated the responsibilities for bridge inspection is required to maintain master lists of bridges that contain the following:

- 1. Fracture critical members. The first digit of the "Recording and Coding Guide for the Structure Inventory and Appraisal of the Nation's Bridges" (hereafter referred to as the Coding Guide), Item 92A, is coded Y (yes).
- 2. Underwater members that cannot be visually evaluated during periods of low flow or examined by feel for condition, integrity, and safe load capacity due to excessive water depth or turbidity. The first digit of the Coding Guide, Item **92B**, is coded Y (yes).

3. Unique or special features requiring additional attention during inspection. The first digit of the Coding Guide, Item **92C**, is coded Y (yes).

The **FHWA**, in managing the bridge inspection program, assures that these special inspections are being accomplished, and associated master lists are being maintained. Regarding master lists, the FHWA requires each master list to include the location and description of the members of a bridge that are fracture critical or require special attention. The master lists are reviewed by the FHWA field offices for completeness and appropriate follow-up on inspection findings in the course of the annual NBIS compliance reviews.

The **NBIS** require the inspecting, inventorying, and maintaining of a master list of those bridges with underwater members which cannot be visually evaluated during periods of low flow, or examined by feel for condition, integrity, and safe load capacity due to excessive water depth or turbidity. These bridges have an underwater inspection frequency of at least once every 5 years. States are required to report semiannually the status of their master lists. Also, the States are required to **identify** the current status of bridges regarding vulnerability to scour (i.e. the degradation of a stream-bed caused by moving water) and to report semiannually the status of their vulnerability assessments.

As of June 30, **1996**, **27,464** bridges (4.7 percent) have been identified as having **fracture** critical members; 22,224 (99.9 percent) of the 22,248 bridges on States' master lists have received an initial underwater inspection; and 478,845 (98.7 percent) of the 484,916 bridges over waterways

nationwide have been screened for scour vulnerability by reviewing existing plans and records. The 22,224 bridges with completed underwater inspections are Federal-aid and non-Federal-aid bridges.

#### INSPECTION FREQUENCY

The NBIS require each bridge to be inspected at regular intervals not to exceed 2 years. Certain types or groups of bridges, because of their structural or functional condition, may require inspection at less than the **2-year** interval.

Effective October 12, 1993, regulations were approved that allow States to adopt inspection intervals that are longer than the basic 2-year interval for certain types or groups of bridges where it is determined that the 2-year interval is not required. Prior FHWA approval is required for inspection intervals exceeding 2 years. Four years was established as the maximum interval between inspections. A State proposing to inspect certain bridges at intervals exceeding 2 years must submit a detailed proposal and supporting data to the FHWA. Guidance for implementation of the extended inspection frequency is contained in FHWA Technical Advisory T 5 140.21.

A d-year inspection interval has been approved for certain types or groups of bridges in the following States: (1) Arizona, (2) Arkansas, (3) Illinois, (4) Montana, (5) New Mexico, (6) North Dakota, (7) South Dakota and (8) Texas. The types of structures approved to date are buried culverts, highly redundant concrete bridges, and prestressed "beam" and "T-Beam" bridges.

It should be noted that the **NBIS** were revised in 1988 to allow longer inspection intervals; however, a decision issued by the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit in February 1992 required that the NBIS again be revised to **specify** a maximum interval of 4 years between bridge inspections.

Exhibits **2-2,2-3** and 2-4 display inspection frequency data for **NHS**, other Federal-aid **highway** and non-Federal-aid highway bridges respectively. A total of 59,667 bridges (10.3 percent) have inspection dates older than 2 years as of June 30, 1996. Of these, 6,700 bridges (1.2 percent) have inspection dates older than 3 years.

#### INSPECTION REPORT AND INVENTORY

The findings and results of bridge inspections are recorded on standard forms. The data required to complete the forms and the functions that must be performed to compile the data are generally contained in the Manual For Condition Evaluation of Bridges: 1994 prepared by the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO).

Each State prepares and maintains an inventory of all bridge structures subject to the NBIS.

Certain structure inventory and appraisal data must be collected and retained within the various departments of the State for collection by the FHWA. A tabulation of this data is contained in the Structure Inventory and Appraisal Sheet distributed by the FHWA as part of the Coding Guide.

Reporting procedures have also been developed by the FHWA.

Newly completed structures, modifications of existing structures which would alter previously recorded data on the inventory forms, or placement of load restriction signs on the approaches to or at the structure itself are required to be entered in the State's inspection reports and the computer inventory file as promptly as practical, but no later than 90 days after the change in the status of the structure for bridges directly under the State's jurisdiction, and no later than 180 days after the change in status of the structure for all other bridges on public roads within the State.

As stated earlier, the findings and results of bridge inspections are recorded on standard forms. However, **a** bridge inspection is not complete until an inspection report is written. Generally, a complete bridge inspection report contains the following sections:

- Introduction
- Bridge Description and History
- Inspection Procedures
- Inspection Results
- Conclusions
- Recommendations
- Appendices (Photographs, Drawings and Sketches, Inspection Forms and etc.)

A well prepared report provides information on existing bridge conditions and also becomes an excellent reference source for **fbture** inspections, comparative analyses, and bridge study projects. Primary purposes of inspection reports include guidance for immediate follow-up inspections or

actions on critical findings, **information** on the needs and effectiveness of routine maintenance activities, information on the need for a load rating analysis, and information on bridge management (decisions for allocating and prioritizing resources).

**FHWA Headquarters** and field personnel also prepare field trip reports on each State's bridge inspection program as part of the overall NBIS monitoring process. One or more reports are prepared annually by the FHWA Division Bridge Engineer. Additional bridge inspection reports are prepared by FHWA Regional and Headquarters Bridge Engineers. During **FYs** 1995 and 1996, FHWA Headquarters Bridge Engineers participated in the following bridge program reviews:

FY 1995 FY 1996

Arizona Connecticut

District of Columbia Idaho

Kansas Missouri

Kentucky Montana

Minnesota Nevada

New Jersey New York

Texas Oklahoma

Virginia Tennessee

West Virginia

31

### **DEFICIENT BRIDGES**

Each year, the FHWA asks the States to update the NBI as part of the continuing inventory and inspection program required by the **NBIS** for all public road bridges. Some States provide updated data more often than once per year.

The total number of highway bridges and the number of deficient bridges continue to fluctuate with each Report to Congress because of the ongoing inspection program, highway system changes, and construction of new bridges. Exhibits **2-5,2-6** and 2-7 display the total number of highway bridges and the total number of deficient bridges by State for NHS, other Federal-aid highway and non-Federal-aid highway bridges respectively.

Exhibit 2-8 displays the status of the Nation's bridges based on the current NBI (June 30, 1996). Changesare shown since June 30, 1994, the date of the data reported in the Twelfth Report issued in June 1995.

It is important to note that **ISTEA** changed the definition of off-system bridges. Under the old definition, the following classification of bridges was recorded in the NBI as of June **30**, 1992:

Federal-aid	<b>276</b> , <b>5</b> 10
Off-system	298,903
TOTAL	575,413

Under the new definition, the following classification of bridges was recorded in the **NBI** as of June 30, **1994**:

NHS 126,911

Other Federal-aid 170,178

Off-system 279,371

TOTAL 576,460

**Currently,** under the new definition, the following classification of bridges is recorded in the **NBI** as of June **30**, 11996:

**NHS** 127,736

Other Federal-aid 170,956

Off-system 283,170

T O T A L 581,862

The number of deficient bridges recorded in the **NBI** and shown in this report is 182,726. This is a decrease of 4,789 (2.6 percent) **from** the **187,5** 15 deficient bridges last reported. The number of deficient Federal-aid bridges now reported is 79,542 (32,920 **NHS** bridges and 46,622 other Federal-aid bridges). The number of deficient off-system bridges now reported is 103,184.

The total number of deficient highway bridges has been gradually reduced over the years and generally under the **HBRRP** the status quo has been maintained.. However, deficient bridge needs continue to accrue as bridges built during the Interstate construction boom era near the end of their **useful** life and continue to age and deteriorate to the point where major rehabilitation or replacement is required.

Exhibit 2-9 displays a comparison between the number of deficient bridges in this report and the previous report. The fact that a bridge is "deficient", either structurally or **functionally**, does not imply that it is likely to collapse or that it is unsafe. With proper load posting and enforcement, most structurally deficient bridges can continue to serve **traffic** safely when restricted to the posted maximum loads. Some functionally obsolete bridges have geometric deficiencies (for example, narrower bridge widths than modern **traffic** require) that can be mitigated, but not eliminated, by the use of roadway striping, signs, signals, crash cushions, and various **traffic** control devices.

#### **LOAD POSTED BRIDGES**

About 114,332 bridges (19.6 percent) nationwide are or should be load posted. A large number of these, exactly 92,661, are off-system bridges. Thus 32.7 percent of the off-system bridges either are or should be posted. Just over 7 percent (about 21,671 bridges) of Federal-aid system bridges are or should be posted. The number of bridges that should be posted, but are not, has decreased **fkom** the 13,503 bridges reported in the Twelfth Report to about 11,822. Exhibits 2-10, 2-11 and 2-12 display the number of posted and closed bridges as of June 30, 1996.

The FHWA requires that reviews be made of individual States to evaluate the level of compliance with the load posting requirement. In cases where substantial noncompliance is found, sanctions are invoked. The FHWA field offices are periodically required to advise Headquarters of the progress and status of sanctions invoked because of noncompliance with load posting requirements.

## HUGHWAY BRIDGE REPLIACEMENT AND REHABILFAITION PROGRAM FUNDING EXHIBIT 1-1 PRE-ISTEA DEDUCTIONS (millions)

	1978 <b>STAA FYs</b> 1979-82	1982 <b>STAA FYs</b> 1983-86	1987 <b>STURAA</b> <b>FYs 1987-91</b>
Discretionary	<b>\$</b> 800.	<b>\$</b> 800.	\$1,125.000(a)
Apportioned (excluding <b>HPR)(b)</b>	3,116.	5,920.	<b>6,731.367</b>
Acceleration of Bridge Projects	200.	0.	0.
Administration	84.	85.	15 <b>1:590</b>
HPR Funds(c)	0.	90 .	102.795
Special Funding (Tahnadge Bridge)	0.	5.	0.
SHRP(d)	0	<b>\$6,900.(æ)</b> 0	20:375
TOTALS	\$4,200:		%8,131.127(e)

- (a) **STURAA** authorized \$225 million each year, 1987 through 1991, for the discretionary bridge program. That Act required a portion of the cost of demonstration projects be taken **from** discretionary funds, including the bridge discretionary fund. In addition, the 1989 Omnibus Budget **Reconciliation((OBR))** Act **(P.L.** 101-239) reduced the **FY** 1990 discretionary authorization. The demonstration projects requirement and the 1989 OBR reduced the available \$1.125 **billion** by approximately \$118.2 million.
- (b) Highway Planning and Research (HHP?R). The 1982 STAA and the 1987 STURAA required that 1.5 percent of apportioned HBRRP funds, as well as the apportioned Federal-aid system funds, be deducted for HPR purposes.
- (c) These funds are the amounts derived **from** bridge funds; however, they may be used for planning and research related to highways as well as bridges.
- (d) Strategic Highway Research Program (SHRP). The 1987 **STURMA** required that 0.25 percent of authorized HBRRP funds, and other authorized Federal-aid **funds**, be deducted for SHRP purposes.
- (e) The 1985 Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation (COBR) Act **(P.L.** 99-272) changed the FY 1986 authorization for **HBRRP** from \$2.05 billion to \$1.9 billion, The 1989 OBR Act changed the FY 1990 apportionment for HBRRP from \$1.372 billion to \$1.353 billion.

### HIGH WAY BRIDGE REPLACEMENT AND REHABILITATION PROGRAM FUNDING

### **EXHIBIT** 1-2 **ISTEA** DEDUCTIONS (millions)

	FY 1992	FY 1993	FY 1994
Discretionary(a)	\$ 57.000	\$ 68.000	\$ 68.000
Apportioned (including <b>HPR)(b)</b>	2,136.394	2,569.765	2,556.844
Indian Reservation Bridges(c)	9.435	14.584	13.833(d)
Administration(e)	62.920	82.860	96.670
Transportation Planning(f)	22.25 1	26.791	26.653
TOTALS	\$2,288.000	\$2,762.000	\$2,762.000
	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997
Discretionary(a)	\$ 69.000	\$ 69.000	************
Apportioned (including HPR)(b)	2,549.114	<b>2,206.05</b> 1	
Indian Reservation Bridges(c)	13.726	11.794	
Administration(e)	103.575	89.998	
Transportation Planning(f)	26.584	23.099	
TOTALS	<b>\$2,762.000</b>	\$2,399.942(g)	\$22,7633.000
	~~~~~~~~~~~		

- (a) The amount shown includes **Rukding** for the **HBRRP** discretionary bridge program and funding for Section 1039 (Highway **Timber** Bridge Research and Demonstration Program) of **ISTEA**.
- (b) Highway Planning and Research **(HPR)**. **ISTEA** required that 2 percent of the apportioned funds shown above be deducted for **HPR** purposes.
- (c) **ISTEA** required not less than 1 percent of the apportionment due to each State which has an Indian reservation within its boundaries to be transferred to the Secretary of the Interior to carry out Title 23, U.S.C., Section 144(g)(4).
- (d) Includes the total of 1 percent of the apportionment due to each State which has an Indian reservation within its boundaries **(\$13,360,209)** plus an additional transfer of \$472,750 as requested by the State of Arizona.
- (e) **ISTEA** required that these funds be deducted for administering the provisions of Title 23, United States Code, and for **highway** research and studies.
- (f) ISTEA required that 1 percent be deducted for transportation planning in urban areas. The 1 percent deduction is made from the total funds remaining after the deduction for administration.
- (g) The authorization of this apportionment was reduced from \$2.763 billion by an estimated 13.14 percent to comply with section 1003(c) of P.L. 102-240.

# HIGHWAY BRIDGE REPLACEMENT AND REHABILITATION PROGRAM ELIGIBILITY EXHIBIT 1-3 FUNDED BRIDGES

Report To Congress	Total Number of Bridges Funded Under the <b>HBRRP</b>
1st (as of 12/31/79)	2, 742
2nd (as of <b>12/31/80)</b>	4,492
3rd (as of <b>12/31/81)</b>	6,964
4th (as of <b>12/3 1/82</b> )	9,046
5th (as of <b>12/3 1/83</b> )	13,577
6th (as of 12/31/84)	18,246
7th (as of 12/31/85)	21,398
8th (as of <b>12131186</b> )	24, 553
9th (as of <b>6/30/88)</b>	28,714
10th (as of <b>6/30/90)</b>	32, 870
1 lth (as of <b>6/30/92)</b>	36, 278
12th (as of <b>6/30/94)</b>	41,807
13th (as of <b>6/30/96)</b>	47, 838

## HIGHWAY BRIDGE REPLACEMENT AND REHABILITATION PROGRAMM APPORTIONED FUNDS EXHIBIT 1-4 BRIDGE CONSTRUCTION UNIT COSTS

	Federal-aid Year Replacement		Non Federal-aid Replacement	
		******		
\$700/sq.	m.((\$655/sqq(kt).)	1990	\$72 1/sq.m.((\$66/sq.fft.))	
722	(67)	1991	722 <b>(67)</b>	
689	(6 <del>4</del> )	1992	700 <b>(69</b> )	
711	(66)	1993	700 <b>(65)</b>	
732	(68)	1994	754 <b>(79)</b>	
764	(7i)	1995	764 <b>(71)</b>	

### **EXHIBIT I-5 STATE HBRRP APPORTIONMENTS**

### U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION

### APPORTIONMENT OF HIGHWAY BRIDGE REPLACEMENT AND REHABILITATION FUNDS

,				APPORTIONMENT	
	FOR	FOR	FOR	FOR	FOR
	FISCAL YEAR	FISCAL YEAR	FISCAL YEAR	FISCAL YEAR	FISCAL YEAR
STATE	1992	1993	1994	1995	3996
	05000.540		00.000.400	40-500-500	
ALABAMA	35028,540	39,663,738	36,060,188	40,580,506	37,625,993
ALASKA	5,310,928	<del>6</del> 39 <u>6,264</u>	6,362,426	8,499,916	7,424,865
ARIZONA	5310,928	6/896,264	5,889,676	6343,031	5,489,165
ARKANSAS	28,469,789	34,041,298	27,826,884	27,903,441	25337,987
CALIFORNIA	126,880,178	158,443,617	163,322,937	166,119,158	157,,133,284
COLORADO	19,654,468	24,279,190	23,891,670	24,630,497	19,785,367
CONNECTICUT	<b>89/835</b> -605	73,659,874	<b>68,445,4</b> 39	50,579,075	35,625,342
DELAWARE	5,364,573	6,460,871	6,426,692	6,407,102	5,544,611
DIST. OF COL.	111,444433(0063	14,286,279	13,375,488	14,208,645	14,522,890
FLORIDA	40,985,489	46,648,600	45,325,661	46,100,134	40,021,285
GEORGIA	34,215,247	48,586,590	44,265,510	42,890,934	35,160,599
HAWAII	13,432,462	14,640,076	18,162,602	19,415,825	15,086,666
IDAHO	5,521,240	6,821,231	6,362,426	6,767,760	5,667,673
ILLINOIS	68,276,637	84,475,636	92,347,447	92,220,749	83,385,632
INDIANA	29,491,204	35064,442	35,288,193	34,396,911	27,742,574
IOWA	29,287,853	38,325,383	38,404,615	38,965,746	32,704,008
KANSAS	33,790,457	40,523,652	40,698,905	39,255,750	34,013,723
KENTUCKY	27,963,159	33,994,521	33,838,846	<b>33,011</b> ,439	27,142,869
LOUISIANA	40,916,021	49,476,117	51,697,756	59,282,728	51,610,450
MAINE	14,143,849	13,494,836	15,234,954	17,192,151	14,341,213
MARYLAND	31,726,943	41,513,167	51965,715	37,203,221	29,156,672
MASSACHUSE ETTES	97,671,922	121,070,765	111,064,287	111,439,236	108,526,452
MICHIGAN	<b>57,153,438</b>	70,490,398	70999,062	68,680, <del>8</del> 09	54,711,608
MINNESOTA	25,623,525	27,319,718	25,285,803	25,488,329	20,908,890
MISSISSIPPI	32,795,401	42,467,092	40,989,451	36,881,427	30,989,412
MISSOURI	59,934,726	82,649,536	85,667,801	85,114,248	71,810,258
MONTANA	<b>8,215,155</b>	9,997,871	10,159,520	11,2 <b>82</b> ,223	10,306,018
NEBRASKA	20947,147 <b>5,310,928</b>	26,106,987	26,293,103	26,030,784	22,984,234 5,480,465
NEVADA	11,946,046	6,3 <u>9</u> 6,2 <u>6</u> 3	6,362,426 <b>12</b> ,344,133	6,343,031	5,489,165
NEW HAMPSHIRE	• •	12,571,822		12,979,507	11,892,082
NEW JERSEY	114,045,028	136,151,754	118,584,031	132,169,542	121,286,156
NEW MEXICO	5,658,475 212, <b>437,09</b> 1	6,915,384	7,001,976	7,951,371	<b>6,533,644</b>
NEW YORK NORTH CAROLINA	46,222,275	255,850,512 62,223,400	2514,1496;994 64,883,245	253,721,235	219,566,610
NORTH DAKOTA	5,310,928	62,223,100 6306,063		67,686,736 6 343 034	57,776,1000 5.490.165
	90,861,275	<b>6,396,263</b> 3 <b>05,276,283</b>	6,362,426 103,966,392	6,343,031	5,489,165
OHO	35,166,411		41,707,731	<b>100,861,110</b> 39,786,027	81,505,787
OKLAHOMA	25,167,848	43,331,867 30,574,640			34 <u>856</u> ,200
OREGON DENNEYI VANIA		<b>30,574,649</b>	35,762,427 357,067,670	36,867,472 256,284,075	30,725,713
PENNSYLVANIA RHODE ISLAND	208,975, <b>868</b> 10,069,089	258434,860 <b>14,913,527</b>	257,067,670 16,900,891	256,284,075 16,455,345	221,784,454 13,760,899
SOUTH CAROLINA	19,010,330	24,476,366	27,363,825		
SOUTH DAKOTA	8,706,948	10,165,709	9,158,584	28,816,897	23,730,760
TENNESSEE		60,299,831	60,741,749	9,510,995 <b>53</b> 653 945	7,772,659
	48,183,951 86,169,205	<b>1620,11</b> 05,095	99,605,543	53,652,815	44,456,694
TEXAS UTAH	5,310, <b>92</b> 8	9,150,494	99,605,545 9 <sub>1</sub> 866 <u>\</u> 08 <u>5</u>	<b>10</b> 5,142,587 10,887,686	89,434,530 9,035,836
VERMONT	10,722,065	13,267,529	නුදන,µය <u>ය</u> 13,542,839	•	9,035,826 10,604,180
VIRGINIA	48962,887	49,328,754	49,746,193	13906,487 <b>48,434,102</b>	<b>50,4495</b> 1 <b>1</b> 75
WASHINGTON	46962,667 <b>48355,568</b>	56,042,264			<b>50</b> ,,4125,175 <b>54.183.551</b>
WEST VIRGINIA	<del>ಇಂತ್ರಾವ್ಯವೃತ್ತ</del> 52,822,161	58,536,013	<b>54,655,521</b>	60,290,255 53 104 066	•
WISCONSIN	29,571,681	36,536,013 3 <b>4,038</b> ,608	54357,216 <b>33 644 757</b>	53,194,066 30,167,709	42,034,808
WYOMING	5,310,928	5/3 <b>96</b> ,263	33,644,757 6 362 426		22,420,606 5.489.165
PUERTO RICO	11,701,850	16,927,742	6,362,426 16,710,684	6,343,031 1.4 507 085	5,489,165
I DENTO NICO		10,321,142	16,710,684	14,507,985	11,057,951
TOTAL	2,136,693,9115	2,569,764,965	2,556,843,741	2,549,114,372	2,206,050,654

### EXHIBIT 1-6

### TOTAL **HBRRP APPORTIONMENTS** AND OBLIGATIONS

## U. S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION HERDERAL HEGHWAY ADMINISTRATION STATUS OF FUNDS PROVIDED FOR BRIDGE REP & REHABS65% ON SYS - 118

AS OF SEPTEMBER 30, 1996

#### **OBLIGATIONS**

		OBLIGA	IIIOND	
STATE	<b>TOTAL</b> AVAILABLE	DURING FY 1996	TOTAL TO DATE	<b>UNDBLEGATED</b> BALANCE
ALARIAMA	321,981,988000	24, 1132, Ø111 559	321,920,5533559	61,4632441
ALASKA	46,081,4578000	8,7732, 9891 984	44,427,198662	1,634,4481398
ARIZZUNA	44,447,2225000	2,559, Ø114.558	32,028,2511224	12,418,973756
ARKANSAS	258,205,927.000	30, 652, 2339 000	241,648,850000	14,557,077.000
CALIFORNIA	536,772,0006007	77,774,0002111	521,581,638@94	15, 190,3367133
COLORADO	164,169,386,000	15,887,048,336	150,583,@20988	13,585,465332
CONNECTIGUT	470,404,813000	24,167,4433061	470,215,221772	165,331.28
DELAWARE	41,638,7265000	1,175,189,655	39,1125,524286	2,811,2770774
DIST. OF CDL.	119,530,047,000	13,360,8650.56	1165,751,741.61	<b>2,778,305.449 1118,807.00 15,735</b> , 138.30 <b>23,802,889.69</b>
FLORIDA	348,538,147,000	25,626,1125000	348,419,340.000	
GEORGIA	370,782,530,00	21,818,874665	355,047,391.770	
HAMAII	77,357,4480,00	19,138,280.080	53,654,590.336	
IDAHO ILLIMO <del>I</del> S INDIASIA ROMA	568 306 35 00000 693,466 361000 297,275,041,00 309,602,284.00	3,6335,99222,177 57,755,4454,558 18,193,407,000 15,960,4611.100	56,308,610000 689,841,6222286 284,546,3305442 281,891,648117	3,625,3998 774 12,728,7235568 27,710,7712 883
KANSAS	354,629,4420665	11,583,267.658	341,183,4508225	113,,445,91/2440
KENTURGKY	340,610,387,000	19,408,685094	321,766,1195560	18;844,881/660
LOMESARMA	484,574,827,000	45,834,063776	424,791,167.006	39,783,669994
MAINE	92;575,844,000	12,884,481.783	85,838,377661	61,937,166.33
MARYLAND	250, 108,020,000	13, 118,350 000	250, 027, 608 000	80,4112,000
MASSACHISSETTS	587,251,1831,000	60,387,6840449	569, 030, 332 002	17,320,228888
MIGHIGIAN	349,895,439,000	71,303,088344	344, 383, 737, 97	5,5111,7701003
MINNESOTA	255, 192,805,000	10,021,43888	237, 203, 226 223	17,989,208,777
MISSISSIPPI	294, 209, 972, 060	31,773,887.000	289, 841, 3777,000	4,368,595,000
WISSOURI	549, 636, 2229 000	62,1179,0022788	547, 371, 2235,744	1,724,293,226
MGAITANA	\$2,067, 9559 555	6,611,7796.447	92,067, 364,889	04.66
NEBRASAA	198, 903, 789 000	144,634,518.446	198, 755, 372,650	148,216,50
NEVADA NEW HAMPSHIRE NEW JERSEY NEW MEXICO	44,748,3365000	5,348,/5/42000	43,091,352000	1,857,013000
	110,150,499.60	8,083,9972991	110,148,405884	4,093.776
	731,450,801.000	99,270,598888	709,256,925440	22,193,875.60
	57,817,446442	1,132,/6811227	54,558,667.889	3,058,778.73
NEW YORK	1,701,901,201,000	1355, 229, 5893.080	1,694,501,7222,00	7 ,399,4472 ,00
NORTH CAROLINA	471,326,586.00	38, 483, 9954.000	447,638,3391,000	23 ,788 ,205 ,00
NORTH DAKOTA	69,85@,371.00	9,067, 7147.4 \$5	69,1113,5555225	845 ,785 .75
OHIO	572,320,#10000	48,023, 2566.777	568,055,3398,063	4 ,265 ,11211 @7
OKLAMOMA	335,538,4463000	25,746,697,444	331,247,2237,999	4,291,2225.@1
OREGON	151,311,7700.000	9,321,3894189	134,851,881.72	116,45@.608.28
PENNSYLVANIA	1,7050,480,023000	57,264,053.135	1,080,955,529.886	24,493.@4
RHODE ISICANO	68,481,947.000	13,658,300665	68,419,@75.14	2,561,871.86
SOUTH <b>CAROLIMA</b>	181, 180, 387.000	1133, 848, 38977. 865	157,714,923~08	23,475,463.992
South <b>Dakota</b>	83, 534, 709 @22	7, 630, /41 19. 559	80,647,77227 <b>7</b> 7	2,886,,@37.15

### **EXHIBIT 1-6** (Continued)

TEMMESSEE	<b>522,365,762.00</b>	38,118, <b>865.20</b>	50 <b>£</b> 27, <b>52</b> 2, <b>911.37</b>	112,61 <b>2,8</b> 50. <b>83</b>
TEXAS	<b>515,320,602</b> 000	64,502, <del>890</del> .336	5 <b>£</b> 4,7477, <b>\$48.</b> \$7	110,5 <b>72,6</b> 63. <b>43</b>
UTAH	53, 804, 838.00	7,463,037.3311	42,405,343.411	11,499,4194.59
VERMONT	98, 724, 068.00	7,344,333.631	\$1,224,773.49	7,429,2294.51
VIRGINEA	244, 576, 933.00	4,181,1178.87	224,216,388.24	20,360,5441.76
WASHINGTON	406, 594, 2221000	38,494,702.01	406,01@,577.98	1,574,643.02
WEST VIRGINIA	382 ,839 , <u>1988</u> 000	32,6859, 188.83	37t, 162, 840, 443	11,877,3227.557
WISCONSIN	301 , 703 ,086 000	12,781,725,889	300, 018, 428 02	1,884,859988
WANING	40 ,810 ,2220 445	859,053.00	38, 061, 585, 445	4,748,6835000
PUERTO RICO	57 ,255 ,047 000	5,1165,2389441	42, 942, 855 07	14,312,11911#93
TOTAL	16,239,660,063.66	1,406,868,6698785	15, 757, 1105, 00391.44	482,655,0024652

### EXHIBIT 1-6 (Continued)

#### U. S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION STATUS OF FUNDS PROVIDED FOR BRIDGE REP & REHABH \$5%, OFF SYS • 117

#### AS OF SEPTEMBER 30, 1998

#### OBLIGATIONS

		OBLIGA	IIONS	
STATE	TOTAL <b>Available</b>	<b>DURING</b> : F <b>Y 1996</b>	TOTAL To <b>date</b>	UNDBLOGATED BAL/ANCE
ALABAMA	74,303,531.\00	6,163,289.383	71,517,550.3B	2,785,880.62
ALASKA ARIZONA-	<b>8,271,587.00</b> <b>10,257,049.00</b>	417,643.441 75,744.\00GR	7,590,011.48 <b>7,269,889</b> .465	681,655.552 2,487,3379.655
ARKANSAS	58, 124, 4411.00	1,013,389.00	52,152,179.VO	6, 972, 262. VO
CALIFORNIA	117,345,242.188	168, 40V, 11113. GEB	110,482,89203	6,862,380.11 <b>5</b>
COLORADO CONNECTACUT	39', 282, @89 .\00 1038, 554, 218.\00	<b>2,337,8112.007</b> 12,180,777 <b>0</b> 886	33,1159,3333658 1022,982,41177,448	<b>6,1122,7355.442</b> <b>571,<b>8V</b>0.8<b>5</b>2</b>
DELAVARE	10,559,052000	731,680.00	10, 354, 2205 660	204,866.40
DIST. OF CD&.	11,000,20962	<b>24,5509.055</b> <b>6.059</b> ,1186.000	1,413,513.87	B,586,695.75
FLORIDA <b>Georgia</b>	80,431,880.\00 85,565,1998.00	<b>5,1178,7209</b> 8 <b>98</b>	80,183,830.V0 83,579,483.40	246,050.V0 1,985,735.G0
HAVATI	18, 622,099 000	5,788,254.00	13,440,5111885	5, MM, \$817.155
IDAHO	12,897,849.338	838,059.\00	12,897,849338	44 500 \0/504 40
ILLIMOIS INDIANA	1160),030, 818.\00 67,537,1192.\00	13, 146,462 337 4,680,370 84	1455,4 <b>82,810.54</b> 67, <b>377,7772</b> : <b>92</b>	144, 538, <b>\007446</b> 1 <b>59</b> , 4\85068
IOWA	80,470,925.\00	4 , 888 , 840 662	80,079,332.339	391,4593,861
KANSAS	<b>86</b> ,752,376. <b>W</b> 0	4,653,293.84	86,3110,6652111	441,7723889
KENTURKY LOUISIAMA	<b>78,002,5580.100</b> 1111,594,11 <b>3</b> 9.000	<b>6,605,643.336</b> 11,013,9 <b>53</b> 390	<b>77,517,90</b> 01680 111,551,7 <del>89</del> 111	1,084,638.440 42,389.89
MANINE	22,188,7726.\00	2,420,7794.897	18, 495,,7705 568	2,693,0020-442
MARYLAND	67,072,617. <b>V</b> 0	7, <b>582,380.</b> 00	51,511,390.000	15,561,227.00
'MASSACHUSETTS MICHIGAN	103, 175, <b>\$23</b> .000 <b>85</b> , <b>B</b> 14,3330.\00	11,851,33582 <b>8,390,840.78</b>	<b>98,931,020</b> .1 <b>16</b> <b>78,80</b> 033 <b>83</b> 083	<b>4 ,244 ,5502 884</b> <b>7 ,1114 ,0168 87</b>
WINNESOTA	50,921,345.\00	3,368,422.658	50,745,~103112	176,241.88
WISSISSIPPI	67,894,608.00	2,965,821.00	65,813,164.00	1,981,442.00
MISSOURI MONTAKA	1477,,443,642.70 21,898,4452065	15, 597, 602. 09 1, 681, 835, 86	146,200,17 <b>\$.73</b> 21.876,0774065	1,237,362.227 <b>320,378.U</b> 0
NEBRASKA	54,890,7163000	3,455,3337.853	<b>54,606</b> ,3341@95	204,421.005
NEVADA	10,328,644.00	858,209 00	9,580,441.00	746,1003000
NEW HAIPSHARE NEW JERSEY	<b>26,076,627.09</b> 182.480.652.00	<b>272,523.49</b> <b>21.824,055</b> .11	<b>24,141,1088777</b> 1 <b>75,669,4499</b> 4 <b>88</b>	<b>1,835,358.23</b> <b>6,8</b> 111,11526 <b>2</b> 2
NEW MEXICO	14,035,678440	1,072,397.449	13,918,2115144	117,463.226
NEW YORK	2699 <del>652</del> 2 6 19#.00	20,686,677.00	2577,,3585,,502.00	122,, <b>29</b> 37,,1177.00
NORTH CAROLINA NORTH <b>DAKOT/A</b>	10B,7 <b>67</b> ,673.00 17,683,46 <b>B</b> ,09	<b>8,665,152.V</b> A) <b>280</b> ). <b>837</b> ,11 <b>9</b>	1008,7830,285600/	7,388 <b>.00</b>
OM10	11493, 2890), (04411. 100	23,748,4418883	117', 136',00211.002 11398', 013',77 <b>5</b> 3'#97	<b>547,447.99</b> <b>4,246,287.0</b> 3
OKILAHOMA	77,4311,9952000	5,1131,1150.557	74,752,5141.30	2,679,437.70
OREGON PENNSYLVANI/A	<b>38,1156,458.10</b> 0 <b>271,</b> 231,216. <b>00</b>	3,390,2 <b>99.684</b> <b>32,587,324</b> .2 <b>8</b>	34,472,1147.992 270 984 024 777	3,684,3110,088
RMODE ISLAND	17,200,89412@9	477,303.##B	<b>270,964,924.</b> 777 10, <b>65</b> 5,188.84	266, 291.23 6,554,652.46
SOUTH CAROLINA	41,813,1167.000	724,137.72	38,614,888@.98	3,1198,2280.002
<b>SOUTH</b> DAKOTA	<b>18,894</b> ,8109000	1,133,177. <del>/8</del> 7	1 <b>8, 866,46</b> 58 <b>8</b> 8	28,353.12

### EXHIBIT **1-6** (Continued).

TENNESSEE	112(1), <b>545</b> ,,844.00	6,603,211 <b>.62</b>	120),518,666.47	27,277.63
<b>TEXAS</b>	113B <sub>1</sub> ,635,522.00	13,4 <b>83</b> ,361 <i>.</i> <b>81</b>	138,813,541.02	21,980.86
UTAH	12,43@,576.00	1,452,808.43	10,805,561, 14	1,634, <b>0</b> 14.88
VERMONT	24,167,092.00	1,506,680. <b>84</b>	24,055,432.7/4	1111,659.26
VIRGINIA	85,753,82@.00	19,730@5833.00	69,411,947.338	16,341,881.62
WASHINGTON	83,829@467.00	8,283, <b>20</b> 1.211	82,842,@86.71	10,886,440.28
West <b>Virginia</b>	922,03@,8922.00	5,966,704.22	56,524,519.00	35,515,473.00
<b>Visconsia</b>	74,171,438.00	3,339,6330.26	73,657,489.223	\$13,046.77
<b>VVONING</b>	10,768,221 @5	903,600.60	10,665,180.60	133,071.95
PUERTO <b>BIGO</b>	16,650,854.00	3,821,252.18	15,151,622.66	1,808,231.34
TOTAL .	3,744,0001,4941.87	3 <b>36,3@14,307</b> .83	3,639,386,923.21	204,675,018.68

### EXHIBIT 1=6 (Continued)

## U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION STATUS OF FUNDS PROVIDED FOR BRIDGE REP & REHAB-20% OW/OFF = 114

AS OF SEPTEMBER 30, 1996

#### **DBCIGATIONS**

		DBCIGAT	1101462	
STATE	TOTAL <b>AVAILABLE</b>	<b>DURING</b> FV <b>1996</b>	TOTAL To <b>date</b>	<b>UNOBICEGATED</b> BALANCE
ALABAMA	98, 117, 414,911	7,264,883.465	<b>88,909,3113.445 9,308,1183.225 12,105,4658224</b>	<b>208,11011.446</b>
ALASKA	10,527,157133	251,042.060		<b>1,2118,99733888</b>
ARIZONA	13,683,036330	1,714,391.00		<b>1,2577,3378006</b>
ARMANSAS  CALIFORMIA  COLORADO	7 <b>6,686,</b> 2213223	3,646,4008000	64,888,083.00	14,798,1130223
	1477,2111U654334	7,1189,5594,656	82,1150,0039133	65,061,615.221
	52,056,271.118	6,695,44211882	45,496,366881	6,659,310437
CONNECTEONT	144, 789, <del>89</del> 4, <del>67</del> 7	6 , 383 , 2	143,475,094337	1,3114,6600330
DELIMARE	14, 085, 788, 229		13,985,899220	119,889.09
DIST. OF COL. FLORIDA GEORGIA HAWAII	53,374,059\\15 107,293,247.445 114,1832@902133 23,786,677884	3 ,792 ,44558	50, 387, 6211.776 104, 945, 982 000 94, 065, 978 42 12, 513, 365 84	2,991,437.339 2,347,3365,445 20,086,89257,71 11,283,312.220
IOAHO ILLINOIS INDIANA IOWA	17,843,1169,652 213,477,010,188 91,958,085,444 98,890,603,335	1,210,4424185 37,273,0020851 8,279,987885 7,194,689.334	17,843,1169 SE2 210,771,5533000 90,186,982 868 97,512,1778777	2,708,33777.188 1,769,1102.776 1,178,428.658
Kansas	116,030,277.445	3,393, <u>/489</u> 857	100, 281, 119928	15,749,078199
Kentikoky	104,838,812,222	1,462,/5144112	100, 013, 7728689	4,823,083653
Louisinna	148,676,027.552	12,483,/205334	148, 577, 41111882	98,685.770
Maine	32,038,076775	4,305,/682.88	28, 062, 224 12 27	3,975,835,448
MARYLAND	64,483,165552	4,218,340.000	64,338,349.000	124, 809.552
NASSACMUSETITS	166,672,892009	13,600,6885004	152,306,006440	16, 366, 8856689
NECHTGAN	114,625,WIL85	5,042,567.333	87,277,8228.320	27, 347, 283 85
NUNNESOTA	83,830,860003	4,358,747.007	80,828,5539001	3,002, 3211.002
MIBBESSIPPI	91, 070,11149,088	7,286,245000	84,450,808.000	8,619,5111.068
MESSOURI	196, 683,2835, V31	32,836,5577,\$00	178,694,864.57	17,991,97274
MONT/RHA	29, 341,3317,694	2,850,629,224	27,761,115559	1,550,1132.33
NEBRASKA	73,216,559,865	3,351,860,711	71,284,784776	1,951,794.89
NEVADA	13,779,6571380	<b>454,833.000</b>	12,661,189000	1, 118, 372, 300
New <b>Manpshire</b>	34,071,341322	<b>1,823,729,448</b>	31,499,78908	2, 581, 652, 224
<b>New Jersey</b>	225,211,1191688	23,083, <b>142.53</b>	197,207,919.110	28, 003, 2242, 658
<b>New Mexico</b>	17,725,665229	<b>104,135,773</b> GR	18,333, 102.48	1, 392, 44728 11
NEW VORK	539,533,116B@94	57, 722,/581000	521,661,6505000	<b>17</b> 7; <b>971</b> ,/663@ <b>94</b>
NorthCaroutna	151,@9338 \$70386	11,085,/844000	151,9183,1118,000	764.38
North Dakota	23,414,624390	1,096,/4177.559	23,379,6699689	<b>34,:824</b> .681
Ohio	1744,120,801 588	24,181,/988659	148,469,1133,553	<b>25,651</b> ,/698.065
GOLDENMA	1038, 286, 579, 200	<b>5</b> ,7713,3884009	89,7730,4406224	113,556,117227 06
OREGON	80, 3332, 971, 17	11,33546888684	57,701,2201222	2,6311,7689 95
PENNSYLVANIA	325, 960, 3862, 868	37,048,2255448	321,218,7783880	4,7422 1068 866
RHODE ISLAND	20, 987, 428, 225	1,261,88970076R	12,879,347.776	8,008,073,449
SOUTH CAROLINA	<b>55,781,834.886</b>	6,7 <b>/69</b> ,3 <b>37:6</b> @98	<b>51,5211,8976146</b>	4,259,858.710
South Dakota	<b>25,203,285</b> 0 <b>08</b>	11,335, <b>84</b> 11. 14	<b>24,056</b> ,,111 <b>5</b> 390	247,1149.728

### EXHIBIT **1-6** (Continued)

TE <del>NNESSEE</del>	160), 785 , 7717.772	112, 089 <u>,5597, 565</u>	11341, 662,77641,778	<b>26</b> ,122,952.894
TEXAS	161, 821 , 764.554	114, 187 <u>,3388</u> 333	11477, 205,33781,6 <b>67</b>	14,61 <b>6,3</b> 85.87
UTAH	16, 597, 834, 772	2,174,819.892	113,,239,662.773	3,358,171.99
VERMONT	30, 262, 488, 470	1,167,410.666	30,204,7754.118	57,734.24
VIRGINIA	85, 615, 7750333	6,756,893.86	82,388,889.30	3,248,851.03
VASHIMGTOM	125, 173, 370, 83	16,863,985.448	105,621,008333	19,552,384.30
WEST <b>VINGIMPA</b>	122, 983,17715 59	9,324,664.99	1172, <b>636</b> ,288 <b>.00</b>	10,,346,883.59
<b>VISCOMING</b>	88, 1197, 3381 12 26	4,050,31272	87,766,866733	431,614.53
WYOMING	14, 011, (025, 980	1,011,218.000	12,936,2228000	1,974,,787.80
PUERTO RICO	22, 826, 866, 155	18,502.111	11,070,337.399	11,758,628.78
ΤΟΤΑΙ	5. NOS .7112 4448555	446.632.791S53	4.671.2014.11483386	434.498.300.189

### **EXHIBIT 1-7 INDIAN RESERVATION BRIDGES**

HFLQ11-02996--- 1 1UM/Y022

TABLE C - STATUS OF INDIAN RESERVATION BRIDGE: 1% HIGHWAY BRIDGE: REPLACIBINENT & REABILITATION PROGRAM (HBRRP) FUNDS 23 U.S.C. MAGO)
Program Code 1 IT, 11NU, 1 12

рате: September 30, 1996

		,	1% <b>HBRRR</b>	SET ASIDES	S CONTRACT	AUTHORI	Ŋ			1% <b>H</b> 8	BINNP OBUIS	ATHONAS	1 111/25/2006		CONTRACT AUTHORITY RETWANKED TO STATES	CONTRACT AUTHORITY RETURNEO TO STATES	<b>CÚRRINT</b> CONTRACT	(XBL:GATIONIS PLANNED) FOR	ESTIMATEO  UNOBUGATEO  BALANCE   AT <b>END</b>
STATE	FY 1992	FY 1993	FY11994	<b>F</b> Y 1995	FY:1996	FY 1997	TOTALS TO OATE	Actual FY 1992	Actual FY 1993	FFY 9994	FY 1995	FY1996	FAY 9997	TOTALS TO DAME	FOR NON IR BRIDGE PROJECTS 11Z	FOR IN BRIDGE PROJECTS INU	AUTHORI TY AVAI LABLE	CURRENT Fay —11T. 11U	OF CURRENT <b>FY</b>
	) 221 221 721 <del>2</del>	named this	CONTRACTOR OF STREET			terra destri	- 1		71.000 1300000				***************************************				<u> </u>		******************
AMbemaa	353.823	400, 843	364, 244	409. 096	382, 752		1. 910. 558	0'	0	0,	9			h	754, 466	0	1,156,092	C	1,156,092
AWasikan	53. 645	64. 607	64, 280	85, 657	75, 530		343,905	53. 645	9	0	214, 730			268,375	j ĝ	0	75,536	75, 530	0
Arizzonea	53. 645	64. 607	537, 016	64. 071	55. 839	i	775, 178	17. 000	60. 382	577, 866				706,326	Cly	0	68. 652	68, 652	0
Obliformia	1.281.617	1. 600. 440	1,649,726	1,677,971	1,598,465		7,808,219	369. 330	1. 156. 855	185. 000	4,498,569		l	6.209,754	<u> </u>	U	1,598,465	1,598,465	0
Golorfeido	198. 529	245. 244	241, 329	248. 792	201, 270		1,135,164	39, 852	318. 240	796	666, 326			925,2114	774 000	0	20909.50	0	209,950
Chormeed licuut Eltoriden	413, 994	744, 039 466, 167	691, 366 457, 834	510. 899 465. 657	362,404		2,308,710 2,2427775	0	, y	0	1 9			9	774. 039 127. 361	754.800	1,534,671 1,336,614	Ų	1,534,671
r-iorion trieho	55, 770				407. 12:		314.95%	0	124, 673	30.000	15, 700			170, 37; 3	127, 301	734,600	144.562	144 500	1330, 614
lowa	295, 836	68. 903 367. 125	64, 266 387, 925	68. 361 <b>393. 59</b> 2	57. 651 332. 687		1.797.166	270, 000	243, 206	526, 00C)	102.660			1/0.3/:3 1.141.866k	1 1	۱ ۷	655.300	144, 582, <b>8.000</b>	647,300
lKızımsızıs	341. 317	409, 329	411, 100	396, 522	346,010		1,904,276	341, 300	409, 345	409.346	198, 277			1,358,26	2	4	546.010	200. 0a. l	346, 010
ILouisime	413, 393	499, 758	522, 199	598.815	525, 016		2,559,081	341, 300	409. 343)	40 <del>3</del> ,340	190, 217			1,330,263	495, 151	417.900	1.646.000	200. 0a. 1	1,646,000
19Maime	142. 867	136, 311	153, 866	173.65	145.884		752, 611	141.000	133.040	,	1 1			274. 04 ln	5, 138	417,300	473.43	9	473, 434
Maseriolaesett:	142. 607	1.222.937	133. 800	1173,036	(43,05A		1.222.937	141,000	100,040	1 6	ď			274.0410	742, 937	480, 000	473,40	7	473, 434
Michigan	577. 307	712, 024	717. 162	693.74C	556.563		3,256,796	0	1.116.000	890.000	501.622			2.507662	742, 3377	100.000	.7/49, 17/	358,386	390, 794
Mimeŝeteta	256, 823	275.956	255. 412	257, 457	212.699		1,260,347	233, 000	290, 779	266.000	202, 000			991.775	3	ő	268.56	268.56É	000, 704
(Wichest queri proprio	331, 266	428, 960	413, 964	372, 539	315.245		1.861.994	294, 772	399, 727	246.000	1560000	1		1.098.4495	3	ō	765.495	142.800	622, 695
Monitoiae	82. 98 1	100, 968	102, 621	113, 961	104, 839		505, 3913	0	176. 000	d lago d	224. 551		l	400. 55	ć	o	104, 831	104.836	022, 000
l'deliversiter	211. 587	263, 706	265. 568	262. 937	233, 811		1,237,627	0	a	736. 999	192, 201			931,20	, ć	0	306,42	306,427	cl
(Vevada	53. 645	64. 608	64. 266	64.071	55,83€		302.429	0	0	l d	150, 000			150,005	Ġ	0	152,429	G	152, 429,
IVewy Mexico	57. 156	69, 852	70, 727	60, 316	66, 464		344, 515	53, 429	69, 052	68,000	86, 770			278.05	Ġ	0	66.46	Ġ	66, 464
I VeW York	2. 145. 829	2:584.348	2,570,676	2,562,840	2,233,579		12:097.272	0	0	l d	0			À	1,7/38,356	4,358,824	6.000,000	1,030,666	4,970,090
13 Carolina	466. 891	628, 516	655. 386	683. 704	587. 737		3,022,234	233. 420	430,000	828, 864	<b>160.477</b>			1,6527,727	Ġ.	0	1.369#464	1,205,100	164, 364
idontin Dakota	53. 645	64. 608	64, 266	64.071	55.639		302.429	0	0	182,5 19	64.071			246,59	Ġ	0	55,831	55,835	ζ.
(3klahomaa	355. 216	437, 695	421. 290	401.879	3545580		1,970)660	355. 200	340. 000	519,000	401, 880			1,616,06(	Ġ	0	354,580	354,580	. Ć
(Mggán	254. 220	306. 834	361,236	372. 396	312. 562		1,609,250	0	125. 935	273. 800	405. 000			864,733	Ś	0	804,S1 f	604. 511	Ç
Filhode Islandi	0	150. 641	170, 716	168. 215	139. 985		627, 557	0	0	d	q			5	150, 641	o	476,916	Ś	476, 916
Stouth Casobiru				291. 079	241, 405		532. 464	0	0	j q	o			3	9	o	532,484	Ç'	532, 464
Shoulth Oaketta	87. 948	102, 663	92, 510	96. 070	79. 068		458,279	68, 984	(39,294	224. 314	100. 000			354, 001	Ģ	o	10/4/27/15	į Ši	104, 275
11 BXBAS	0	1,011,162	1,006,116	1,062,046	909, 788		3,989,1112	0	0	1,600,000	0			1,600,000	Ģ	q	2,389,1112	Į \$1	2,389,11/2
Ulah	53. 645	82, 429	09. 657	109, 976	81, 916		447, 625	0	0	0	53, 645			53,64	62, 429	0	301, 551	Şi	301. 551
\Nashington	466. 440	566. 083	552. 075	608,992	551, 191		2,766.781	0	798, 281	657. 000	366, 097			1,821,371	9	q	945,400	945,400	ą
\Niscomsin	298.705	343. 824	339. 846	304. 724	228. 077		1,515,176	0	109.762	388, 000	299, 234			796(99)	4	0	718,180	718,180	g
\Nyoming	53. 645	64,608	64. 286	64, 071	55. 839		302,429	0	٩	104. 000	142, 590		_	246,59	9	O	55,83	55.839	Q
77-m	m- <del>- M</del>	الاسانيين	· annaGranistici:						a	-			<u>b-e</u> -			.——	<u> </u>		
li Contentina	9.435;285	14,593;635	<b>1</b> 3. 832. 959	13,726.378	11.87 7,667	al	6 i3,465,924	2,47009241	6.262.763	8,715,524	9, 153, 458	0	<u>o</u>	26,602,706	4,880,520	6,011,524	25. 961. 174	8:445,899	17,515,276
	LI	m.c.	L		l		<u> </u>			l	<u> </u>	I		L					

## HIGHWAY BRIDGE REPLACEMENT AND REHABILITATION PROGRAM TRANSFERABILITY OF BRIDGE APPORTIONMENTS EXHIBIT I-8 TRANSFER

STATE	FY119992	FY119993	FY10394	FYIQ995 sw-mm	FyiQ96 =-ew-=-m
CA	\$30,000,000:00	\$27,949,454.00	\$98,183,0 <b>35.00</b>	\$65,118,711000000	\$77,541,559.00
CO	\$6,399,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$6,66	\$0.00
DE	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$3,819, i 50.00
HA	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$4,391,418.00	\$0.00
	\$11 <b>,000,000,00</b>	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$25,777,000.00	\$10,97 <b>4,284.00</b>
KA	\$0,60	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$23,0%0,000.00
IA	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$19,000,000. <b>00</b>	\$0.00
ME	\$0.00	<b>\$5,250,000.00</b>	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
MD	\$12,400;000. <b>00</b>	<b>\$8,150,000.00</b>	\$20,3370,000000	<b>\$14,580,000.00</b>	\$11, <b>500,000.00</b>
M A	\$32,544 <b>,284</b> .00	<b>\$28,</b> 11 00,000.00	\$25,000,00 <b>0.00</b>	<b>\$37,889,340.00</b>	\$0.00
MI	\$22,400,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
MO	\$23,471,00 <b>0.00</b>	<b>\$</b> 32,390,000. <b>00</b>	\$0.00	\$33,364,786.00	\$0.00
NE	<b>\$8,211,28</b> 11.00	<b>\$</b> 10,233,9 <b>39.00</b>	<b>\$10,306,896.00</b>	\$10,204,067.00	\$0.00
NJ	<b>\$37,999,803.00</b>	<b>\$45,365,764.00</b>	<b>\$39,512,199.00</b>	\$0.00	\$0.00
NM	<b>\$1,885,403.00</b>	\$2,304,206.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
ОН	\$1 <b>6,600</b> 0, <b>00</b> 0.06	\$0.00	<b>\$40,750,000.00</b>	\$0.00	\$0.00
OR	\$10,000,0 <b>00.00</b>	\$0.00	\$0.00	<b>\$3,300,000.00</b>	\$22,430,045.00
PA	<b>\$</b> 81,91 <b>8,540.00</b>	<b>\$101,306,465.00</b>	<b>\$100,770,526.00</b>	<b>\$100,463,358.00</b>	\$95,000,000.00
RI	\$0.00	<b>\$4,969,187.00</b>	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
v	<b>\$43,020,447.00</b>	<b>\$19,313,553.00</b>	<b>\$19,500,508.<b>00</b></b>	<b>\$18,921,972.00</b>	\$24,873,762.00
WV	\$0.00	<b>\$16,000,000.00</b>	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
WI	<b>\$11,592,1<b>76.00</b></b>	\$13,3 <b>43</b> ,1 <b>34.00</b>	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
WY	<b>\$0</b> , <b>@0</b>	<b>\$4,589,219.00</b>	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
PR	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	<b>\$19,949,441</b> 1.00	\$0.00
TOTAL	\$342,841, <b>934.00</b>	<b>\$3119</b> }2 <b>86#</b> ; <b>922</b> 1.66	<b>\$354,393,164.00</b>	\$352,960,092.00	<b>\$269,138,800.00</b>

## HIGHWAY BRIDGE REPLACEMENT AND REHABILITATION PROGRAM DISCRETIONARY BRIDGE PROGRAM EXHIBIT 1-9 APPROPRIATIONS

FISCAL YEAR	APPROPRIATION	DEDUCTIONS	NET APPROPRIATION
1979	\$200,000,0000.00		\$200,000,0000.00
1980	\$200,000,000.00	s o . o o	\$200,000,000.00
1981	\$200,000,000.00	\$ 0 . 0 0	\$20 <b>0,000,00</b> 0.00
1982	\$200,000,000.00	\$ 0 . 0 0	\$200,000,000.00
1983	\$200,000,000.00	<b>š</b> 0 . 0 0	\$200, <b>000,00</b> 0.00
1984	\$ <b>200,000</b> ,000 @D	<b>š</b> 0 . 0 0	\$200,000,000 @D
1985	<b>\$200,000</b> 0,000 @D	<b>š</b> 0 . 0 0	\$200,000,000.00
1986	<b>\$200,000</b> 0,000 00	\$ 0 - 0 0	<b>\$200,000,000</b> .00
1987	<b>\$225,000</b> ,0000.00	\$39,902,319.00	<b>\$185,097,681</b> .00
1988	<b>\$225,000,000</b> 0.00	<b>\$11,207,219.00</b>	<b>\$213,792,781</b> .00
1989	<b>\$225,000,000</b> 0.00	\$15,230,50466.000	<b>\$209,769,954.00</b>
1990	<b>\$225,000,00</b> 0.00	\$27,336,819.00	<b>\$197,663,181</b> .00
1991	<b>\$225,000,000</b> 0.00	\$24,5 <b>20,35</b> 4.00	\$200,479,646.00
1992	<b>\$57,000,000</b> 0.00	\$8,000,000.00	\$49,000,000.00
1993	<b>\$68,000,000</b> .00	\$8,500,000.00	\$5 <b>9,500,000</b> .00
1994	<b>\$68,000,000</b> .00	\$8,50 <b>0,000</b> .00	\$59,50 <b>0,000</b> 0.00
1995	<b>\$69,000,000 .00</b>	\$8,500,000.00	\$60,500,000.00
1996	<b>\$69,000,000 0</b> 0	<b>\$8,500,000</b> .00	\$60,500,0000.00
1997	\$69,000,000.00	\$8,500,000.00	\$60,500,000.00
TOTAL	\$3,125,000,000 000	\$168,6 <b>9</b> 6, <b>7</b> 57.00	\$2,956, <b>303</b> ,243.00

## HIGHWAY BRIDGE REPLACEMENT AND REHABILITIATION PROGRAM DISCRETIONARY BRIDGE PROGRAM EXHIBIT 1-4100 FUNDS

<b>F</b> ∀	PREVIOUS <b>FY</b> Carryover .	AVAILABLE	ALLOCATION	ACCUMULATIME ALLOCATION	UNALLOCATED BALANCE
1979	- \$0.00	\$200,000,000.00	\$197,696,000000	\$197,696,000.00	\$2,304,000.00
1980	\$2,304,000000	\$202,304,000.00	\$198,351 <b>,000.00</b>	<b>\$396,047,000</b> .00	\$3,953,000.00
1981	\$3,9 <b>53,000</b> 00	\$203,953,000.00	<b>\$202,642,461</b> .00	<b>\$598,689,4461</b> .00	\$13310,539000
1982	\$1,310,539.00	\$201,310,539.00	<b>\$201,,2811,3355000</b>	\$799,970,816.00	\$29,184.000
1983	\$29,184.00	\$200,029,184.00	\$158,0006,9004000	<b>\$</b> 957,977, <b>720</b> .000	\$42,022,2280000
1984	\$42,022,280.00	\$242,022,280.00	\$2 <b>22,98</b> 11,78 <b>8</b> 0223	\$1 <b>,180,959,500.23</b>	\$19,040, <i>4</i> 09,9777
1985	\$19,040, <del>499</del> .777	\$219,040, <del>499</del> .777	\$197,209,612229	<b>\$1,378,169,112.52</b>	\$21,830,887.498
1986	\$21, <b>830,887.</b> 48	\$221,8 <b>30,887</b> .448	<b>\$219,404,658785</b>	<b>\$1,597,573,771</b> .27	<b>\$2,426,2287</b> 33
1987	\$2,426 <i>,22</i> 28783	<b>\$187,523,90973</b>	\$186,134,023557	<b>\$1,783,707,794</b> 884	\$1,389,886.116
1988	\$1,389, <b>886.16</b>	<b>\$215,182,667</b> 116	\$21 <b>3</b> ,5777,4833665	<b>\$1,997,285,228.49</b>	<b>\$1,605,233353</b> 1
1989	\$1, <b>605</b> ,233551	<b>\$211</b> ,375,18 <b>87</b> 551	\$2 <b>09</b> ,1 <i>72</i> , <i>22</i> 66779	\$2,206,4 <b>57</b> ,4 <b>9</b> 5. <b>2</b> 8	\$2,202,920.72
1990	\$2,2 <b>02,920</b> <i>77</i> <b>2</b>	<b>\$199,866,11011.7722</b>	\$1 <b>88,274</b> ,8 <b>2</b> 62 <b>2</b> 2	<b>\$2,394,73323321</b> SO	<b>\$</b> 11,591, <b>275.50</b>
1991	\$11,591, <b>27</b> 5.50	\$21 <b>2,070,921</b> .50	\$211,2 <del>65</del> 649755	\$2,605 <b>,997</b> ,9 <b>7</b> 11. <b>2</b> 5	\$805271.75
1992	\$805,271. <i>7</i> 5	<b>\$49,805,271.75</b>	\$47,620, <b>796</b> .74	\$2,653,61 <b>8</b> ,7 <b>67</b> . <del>99</del>	<b>\$2,184,477</b> 550011
1993	<b>\$2,184,</b> 447550 <b>01</b>	<b>\$61,,684</b> ;47755001	<b>\$57,916,8</b> 1148 <b>9</b> 1	<b>\$2,711,535,582.80</b>	<b>\$</b> 3,767,66 <b>0</b> .2 <b>0</b>
1994	\$3,7 <b>67,660.20</b>	\$63,267,660.20	\$60,664, <i>37</i> 8897	\$2,772 <b>,</b> 199,961.67	<b>\$2,603,2811.333</b>
1995	\$2,603,281.33	\$63,103,28133	\$50 <b>,738</b> ,99836	\$2,8 <b>22,938,960</b> . <b>0</b> 3	<b>\$12,364,282997</b>
1996	<b>\$12,364,282.97</b>	<b>\$72,864,282.97</b>	\$61,2890,0950855	\$2,8 <b>84,829,01</b> 0. <b>88</b>	<b>\$10,974,232</b> 1122
1997	\$10,974,2 <b>32.112</b>				

## HI GHWAY BRIDGE REPLACEMENT AND THE HAB! LITATION PROGRAM DISCRETION WARY BRIDGE PROGRAM EXHIBIT 1-11 1 PROJECTS

STATE	BRIDGE	FUNDS ALLOCATED	INITIAL FY
Alabama	Dog River	\$10,314,300.00	1992
	Cochrame .	\$79,820,116.87	1979
	Claiborne Murphy	\$7,569,224.02	1982
	W B Crumpton	<b>\$9</b> ,49 <b>4</b> ,50 <b>3</b> .62	1987
	<b>G S</b> Houston	\$11,696,000.00	1991
	W R King	<b>\$12,830</b> ,5561551	1988
Alaska	Gastineau Channel	\$20,079,860.76	1979
Arizona	Litte Colorado Rv.	<b>\$4</b> ,455,585.29	1987
California	Golden Gate	\$59,365,538.08	1979
	San Mateo	\$6,368,779.46	1980
	Russian Rv. Preston	\$21,,477,,000.00	1983
	Fishermans Ch.	\$10,539,063. <del>44</del>	1987
	Mission Bay Ch.	\$10,100,000.00	1985
	Potato <b>Slough</b>	\$15,160,0000000	1988
Colorado	Arroyo Seco	\$12,696,0000000	1989
Colorado	<b>Coßåx Lafimer</b> Speer <b>Blvd</b> l.	<b>\$48,132,183.38</b> <b>\$15,786,999.00</b>	1982
	<b>Broadway</b> Viaduct	\$15,766,99 <b>9</b> .00 \$11,1368,771668 <b>5</b> 1	1987
	23rd St Vi aduct	\$25,000,000.00	1995 1994
Connecticut	Lake <b>Saltonstall</b>	\$9,79 <b>4</b> ,400.00	1994
Commodicat	NianticRi ver	\$19,338,3200.00	1988
	Yellow Mill Pond	\$8,000,000.00	1995
	Cos Cob	<b>\$4,,984,,282.00</b>	1996
Delaware	Augustine	\$6,006,602.10	1980
	USI 13 St Jones Rv.	\$7,791,833091	1982
Dist of Col.	Francis Scott <b>Ke</b> y	\$15,860,000.00	1982
	J P <b>Sousa</b>	\$17,600,000.00	1991
Florida .	Barron Collier	<b>\$8,928,432.00</b>	1980
	Port Orange C'way	<b>\$8</b> , 160, 000.00	1987
	Acosta	\$62,300,000.00	1988
Georgia	13th Street	<b>\$7,,794,,826.36</b>	1986
	Tonas Causway	<b>\$19,212,064.08</b>	1980
Hawaii	Wait0a	<b>\$4</b> ,,400,,000.00	1988
I daho	<b>Bonnets Ferry</b>	\$8,699,943.00	1982
	Old <b>Town</b>	<b>\$5,769,706.00</b>	1986
	Sandpoint	<b>\$9,600,000.00</b>	1979
Minain	Gaff	\$9,800,000.00	1995
Illinois	La Salle <b>Peru</b>	\$36,510,5501 A6	. 1983
	Staley Viaduct US36 Florence	<b>\$27,773,000.00</b> <b>\$24,662,468.28</b>	1984 1979
	Pekin Rt 9	\$24,602,400.25 \$14,48 <b>3,970.63</b>	1979
	Franklin Street	\$14,46 <b>3,97</b> 0.65 \$39,34 <b>5,000.00</b>	1979
	Poplar <b>Street</b>	\$14,8 <b>53,898.00</b>	1983
	Pulaski	\$5,800,000.00	1995
	Mi chi gan <b>Ave</b> Vi aduct	\$7,200,000.00	1996

III/Miccouri	Miss D. Ouines		
III/Missouri	Miss Rv. Quincy	\$36,368,11211 .OO	1979
	Martin Luther King	\$15,3310,000.00	1988
low@Wfooonsin	Clark US 67	\$79,118,639.00	1990
low@Wisconsin lowælllimoiss	Dubuque Eagle Point Burlington	\$52,806,400. <b>07</b>	1979
10 Wath III I LURS	Keokuk	\$47,485,256331 \$20,808,226	1983
	Julieth Dubuque	\$20,898, <b>339.49</b>	1979
lowa/Nebraska	Mo Rv. Sioux City	\$21, <b>521</b> ,5477.000	1991
	US 36 Mo. Rv.	\$3,088,360.76 \$13,000,505,50	1979
Kansas/Mo. Kansas	West Kansas Ave.	\$17,369,535. <b>59</b>	1979
Maine	Million Dollar	\$16,820,767. <b>76</b>	1983
Walle		\$12,800,000.00	1979
	<b>Wiscassett</b> Edge. Penobscot	\$6,44 <b>0,000</b> 000	1980
Mandand	Rt 450 Severn Rv.	\$7,200,0000000	1995
Maryland		\$31,672,6550000	1991
	US500-33011 Severn RV South River	\$10,932,625.00	1986
Massachusetts	Fore Rivet	\$17,388, <b>633.00</b>	1980
	Third Street	\$28,94 <b>9.30</b>	1979
Michigan	MacArthur	\$20,673,839. <b>54</b>	1980
		\$10,720, <b>000.00</b>	1982
Minnesota	Military Street Wabasha Street	\$8,592,000.00 \$6,000.000	1991
Willinesota		<b>\$6,000,000.00</b> <b>\$43,7</b> 11 <b>5</b> 21 27.00	1996
	Bloomington <b>Ferry</b>	• • •	1991
	High <b>Blatnik</b>	\$1 <b>6,996</b> ,5333001	1984
	Lake <b>Street</b>	\$6,931 ,000.00	1993
Mississippi		<b>\$9</b> ,11 00,000.00	1989
Milooloolhhi	Escatawpa River Fort Bayou	\$5,948,095.0 <b>0</b> \$8,050,536.0 <b>0</b>	1984
Miss/Louisiana	Natchez Vidafia	\$6,050,536.0 <b>0</b> \$4 <b>6,897</b> ,;113381111	1983 1979
Missouri	ASB	\$33,127,919. <b>79</b>	1979
WIISSOULI	US54 Grand <b>Glaize</b>	\$6,979,1 <b>22.77</b>	1982
	US 67	\$18,684,894.4 <b>5</b>	1979
	Broadway <b>Pennway</b>	\$9,460,162.52	1987
	SR 115Mo. Rv.	\$11,730,500. <b>30</b>	1990
	Cape Girardeau	\$2,000,000000	1996
	Chauteau	\$5,000,000000	1996
Montana	Warden	\$2,736,0000000	1983
Nebraska/lowa	Nebraska City	\$12,506,380531	1982
Nevada	Wells Avenue.	\$12,080 <b>,000.00</b>	1988
New Hampshire		\$20,333,6500999	1986
	Scammel	\$5,000,0000000	1996
New Jersey	Pulaski Skyway	\$15,308,0996000	1984
	Rt 40 Inside Thora.	\$12,700,000.00	1987
	Rt22W/B Waverly Yds.	\$11 <b>,136,660.90</b>	1982
	Grassy Sound	\$10,263, <b>000.00</b>	1990
New York	Route 104	\$6,000,0 <b>00,00</b>	1995
	University Heights	\$10,400,000000	1987
	Brooklyn.	\$102,370,996000	1983
	Manhattan	\$71,912,7/67/000	1979
	Queensboro	\$143,338,000.00	1979
	south Park	\$7,534, <b>858.00</b>	1979
	Little Falls	\$3,050,000.00	1979
	Father Baker	\$28,170,000.00	1988
	Eastchester Creek	\$14,034,800000	1993
	East <b>Tremont</b> Ave.	\$5,952, <b>375.00</b>	1993
	I-2237/Saw Mill P'way	\$1 0,000,000.00	1996

	Macombs Dam	. \$1 <b>ଚ,ଚରେ,ଉର୍</b> ର ଉତ୍ର	1996
NY/Vermont	Rouses Point	<b>\$18,862,110.00</b>	1981
North Carolina	<b>US</b> 421 Cape Fear	\$8,798,434.00	1982
North Dakota	<b>Bismarck</b> Memorial	<b>\$11,975,296.56</b>	1981
Ohio	N Main St Viaduct	<b>\$24,133,687.00</b>	1979
	8 Tinkers Creek	<b>\$</b> 5,4 <b>89,992.00</b>	1983
	Hoppile St Viaduct	<b>\$7,020,526.83</b>	1985
	Main Ave	<b>\$51,268,934.00</b>	1984
Oregon	<b>Alsea</b> Bay	\$20,00 <b>0,000.00</b>	1987
	Center Street	<b>\$</b> 16, <b>175,195.75</b>	1979
	South Slough	\$9,870,000.00	1989
Pennsylvania	Beaver Falls Rt 18	<b>\$</b> 10,245,3 <b>27.00</b>	1980
	Belle Vernon	\$8,220,000.00	1991
	Bloomfield	\$23,510,9 <b>3</b> 3 <i>X</i> 66	1979
	Minsi <b>Trail</b>	<b>\$12,414,</b> 775553 <b>88</b>	1982
	Monongahela Rv.	<b>\$13,899,000</b> 000	1983
	Towanda	<b>\$</b> 7,875,2 <b>62.93</b>	1983
	Passyunk Ave.	<b>\$30,000,000.00</b>	1979
	Rochester <b>Monaca</b>	\$16,114,3 <b>65.46</b>	1982
	Walnut Street	<b>\$20,040,000.00</b>	1987
	Girard & Belmont	\$16,1000,00000000	1988
	West End	\$15,028,800000	1989
Rhode Island	Jamestown	\$45,818,000.00	1979
	Washington	<b>\$4</b> ,400,000.00	1996
South Carolina	Battery Creek	\$11,040,000.00	1991
	Skull <b>Mackey Creek</b>	\$15,0000,33811938	1979
	Sampit River	\$11,596,857.45	1980
	James Island	\$101,269,150000	1981
south Dakota	Forest City	\$13,286,43B722	1991
Tennessee	Sidney Lewis	\$11,699,625000	1983
	Alvin York	\$9, <b>854</b> ,632.000	1984
	Walnut Street	\$13,896,244000	1982
Toyoo	<b>SR 115 Kannes Brazes Rv.</b> Div. Ch.	\$11,618,000.00 \$8,400,000.00	1987
Texas	Williams Viaduct	\$0,400,000.00 \$12,000,0 <b>00</b> .00	1980 1986
Virginia	Nansemond Rv.	\$3;353,000.00	1979
	James River	\$24,323,9 <b>05</b> .1 <b>0</b>	1979
	Robert <b>E Lee</b>	\$1,905,88 <b>8.00</b>	1983
Machinaton	Ebey Siough	\$20,35 <b>7,000.00</b>	1991
Washington	Passe Kenniwick	\$3,609,000.00	1979
	Swinomish Channel	\$10,985,126.5 <b>0</b>	1979
	West Seattle .	\$60,000,0000	1981
WestVir.//Othic	Weirton Stuben.	\$44,504,7752775	1982
	Old <b>William. Marietta</b>	\$20,462,51 <b>9.00</b>	1987
West Virginia	Sixth Street	\$22,730,000.00	1990
1100t Tilgillia	<b>Cheliyan</b>	\$12,000,000.00	1995
Wisconsin/Miinn.		\$57,386,862,63	1979
	Wabasha Nelson	\$8,911,0 <b>80.95</b>	1986
		· · · · · · · · · ·	

TOTAL \$2,884,829,010.88

## HIGHWAY BRIDGE REPLACEMENT AND REHABILITATION PROGRAM TIMBER BRIDGE CONSTRUCTION GRANT PROGRAM EXHIBIT I-12 TIMAPP

FY	PREVIOUS FY CARRYOVER	AVAILABLE	ALLOCATION	ACCUMULATIVE <b>ALLOCATIO</b> N	UNALLOCATED BALANCE
~~~~					~~~~
1992	\$0.00	<b>\$7,000,000.00</b>	\$4,498,535.00	<b>\$</b> 4,498,535 <b>.00</b>	\$2,507,465.300
1993	\$2,501,465. <b>Q</b> 0	\$10,001,44655000	<b>\$9,358,40</b> 3 000	\$13,856,938000	\$643,062.000
1994	\$643, <b>062</b> .000	\$8,143,062000	\$7,104,1190000	\$20,961 <b>,128000</b>	\$1,038,872000
1995	\$7,038,872 <b>.00</b>	\$8,5 <b>38,872</b> 000	\$6,22 <b>8,57</b> 2000	<b>\$27,189,700000</b> 0	\$2,310,300.000
1996	<b>\$</b> 2,310,300 <b>.00</b>	\$9,81 <b>0,30</b> 0 @0	\$8,78 <i>6,77</i> 9.000	<b>\$35,976</b> ,4779000	\$1,023,521.00
1997	<b>\$1,023,521</b> .00				

## HIGHWAY BRIDGE REPLACEMENT AND REHABILITATION PROGRAM TIMBER BRIDGE CONSTRUCTION GRANT PROGRAM EXHIBIT I-13 TIMREGST FY 1992-96

STATE	NUMBER OF FUNDED PROJECTS N	
REGION 1		
Mainæ	10	\$2,671, <b>597.00</b>
Massachusetts	1	\$198,960.00
New Hampshire	4	\$593, <b>039.00</b>
New Jersey,	10	<b>\$3,547,036.00</b>
New York	23	\$7,037, <b>340</b> .00
TOTAL	48	\$14,047,972.00
REGION 3		
Delaware	1	<b>\$340,000.00</b>
Maryland	1	\$64 <b>0,000.00</b>
Pennsylvania	1	<b>\$176,000.00</b>
Virginia	8	<b>\$1,386,487.00</b>
West Virginia	15	\$2,59 <b>5,320.00</b>
TOTAL	26	\$5,1 <b>37,807.00</b>
REGION 4		
Aladotime	2	<b>\$403,240.00</b>
TOTAL	2	\$403,240.00
<b>REGION 5</b>		
Illinois	14	<b>\$3,158,776.00</b>
Michigan	15	\$2,684, <b>614.00</b>
Minnesota	18	\$3,223,076.00
TOTAL	47	\$9,066, <b>466.00</b>
REGION 7	_	****
Iowa	5	\$742,080.00
Kansas	4	\$627,864.00
Missouri	7	\$1,921,3394.00
TOTAL	16	\$3, <b>291,338.00</b>
<b>REGION 8</b>		****
Colorado	3	\$265,264.00
TOTAL	3	\$265, <b>264.00</b>
REGION 9	_	
Arizona	1	\$69,000.00
TOTAL	1	\$69,0 <b>00.00</b>
REGION 10		<b>*</b>
Oregon	<b>'1</b>	\$825,600.00
Washington	6	\$2,869, <b>792,00</b>
TOTAL	7	\$3,69 <b>5,392.00</b>
GRAND TOTAL	150	\$3 <b>5,97</b> 6,4779000

### HIGHWAY BRIDGE REPLACEMENT AND REHABILITATION PROGRAM

TIMBER BRIDGE CONSTRUCTION GRANT PROGRAM

EXHIBIT i-14 TBCGP92

TN **ST** COUNTY NET ALLOCATION ADD. **ALLOC'S** WITHDRAWALS NET TOT. ALLOC. SUBSEQ. YRS. SUBSEQ. YRS.

<del>-</del>	1/0 6 10/ 14/21 1	¢0.00		Φς 22
1	KS Funds Withdrawn	\$0.00		\$0.00
2	MO Dent	\$377,600.000		\$377,600.00
3	WA Lewis	<b>\$768,000.00</b>		<b>\$</b> 768 <b>,000</b> .000
4	MI Livingston	<b>\$</b> 122,060.0 <b>0</b>	<b>\$78,946.00</b>	<b>\$201,006.00</b>
4	MI Wexford	\$81,310.00	\$81,310.00	\$0.00
5	VA Roanoke	\$0.00		\$0.00
6	NY Steuben	\$216, <b>800</b> .00		\$216 <b>,800</b> .00
6	NY Cataraugus	\$166,780.00		\$166, <b>780</b> .00
6	NY Chautauqua	\$228,000.00	\$194.00	\$227,806.00
6	NY St. Lawrence	\$779,600.000		\$779,600.00
7	ME Oxford	\$268,400.000	\$117,993.00	\$386,393.00
7	ME Cumberland	\$109,120.00	<b>\$127,044.00</b>	\$236,164.00
а	AL Tuscaloosa	\$0.00		\$0.00
а	AL Geneva	\$350,915.00	<b>\$350</b> ,915.0 <b>0</b>	\$0.00
а	AL Crenshaw	\$250,670.00	\$23,4 <b>30</b> .00	\$227 <b>,240.00</b>
а	A L Barbour	\$64,000.00	\$64,000.00	\$0.00
8	AL Barbour	\$74,880.00	\$74,8 <b>80</b> .00	\$0.00
8	A L Barbour	\$92,800.00	<b>\$92,800.00</b>	\$0.00
а	AL <b>Barbour</b> .	<b>\$64,000.00</b>	\$64,0 <b>00</b> .000	\$0.00
а	A L Barbour	\$92,800.00	<b>\$92,800.00</b>	\$0.00
а	AL Barbour	<b>\$</b> 104,800.0 <b>0</b>	\$ Il04,2806.66	\$0.00
а	AL Franklin	<b>\$176,000.00</b>		\$176,0000000
а	AL Shelby	\$0.00		\$0.00
a	AL Baldwin	<b>\$110,000.00</b>	\$11 0,000.00	\$0.00
9	MS Funds Withdrawn	\$0.00	·	\$0.00

TOTAL \$4,498,535.00

### SUMMARY PY 92

11' Funded Projects

AL 2 ME 2 MI 1 MO 1 NY 4 WA 1

N ST (	COUNTY	NET ALLOCATION <b>FY</b> 1993	ADD. <b>ALLOC'S</b> SUBSEQ YRS.	WITHDRAWALS SUBSEQ. YRS.	NET TOT. ALLOC.	
OR		\$825,600000			\$825,600.00	
	Somerset	\$678,400000			\$678,400.00	
	Somerset	\$335,200.000			\$335,200.00	
	Panobscot	\$132,000.00			\$132,000.00	
	Piscataquis Seneca	<b>\$381,040000</b> \$0.00			<b>\$381,040.00</b>	
	sierieca Allegany	\$1 <b>72@0000</b>			\$0.00	
	runggany Niàgara	\$408,000.00			\$1772,000.00 \$468,660.00	
	Steuben	\$180,000.00			\$180,000.00	
	Allegeny	\$132,000.00			\$132,000.00	
	Allegany	\$124,000.00			\$124,000.00	
	Onondaga	\$0.00			\$0.00	
	oswego	\$0.00			\$0.00	
	Chsnango	\$0.00			\$0.00	
	oswego	\$0.00			\$0.00	
	Chautauqua	\$248,000.00			\$248,000.00	
	Richmond	\$180,000.00			\$180,000.000	
	Logan	\$180,400.00			\$180,400.00	
WVS	Summers	\$110,880,00			\$110,880.00	
WV I	Doddiridge	\$152,240.00			\$152,240.00	
WV	MicDowell	\$103,840.00			\$103,840.00	
	Roane	\$0:00			\$0.00	
WVH	Hardy	\$127,160.00			\$127,160.00	
MN	Remville	\$777,,380.00			\$77,980.00	
MNV	Watonwan	\$48,7740000			\$48,740.00	
	Aroostook	<b>\$184,000.00</b>		s184,000.w	\$0.00	
MEN		\$239,266:00			\$239;200.00	
*****	Franklim	\$198, <b>960</b> ) <b>00</b>			\$198,960.00	
	Delaware	<b>\$240,437000</b>		\$41,020000	\$199,417.00	
VA 🖡	Accom <b>a</b> ck	\$93},090.700			\$93,000.00	
	dams	\$1 <b>36,000</b> 000			\$136,000.00	
	Pipestone	\$109,860.00			\$109,860.00	
	Winona	\$1 <b>66,298</b> 000		_	\$166,298.00	
	Ashtabule	\$288,000.00		\$288,000.00	\$0.00	
	Livingston	\$117,144.00			\$117,144.00	
	Crawford	\$100,000.00		4.4.50	\$1 <b>00,000.00</b>	
	Montgomery	\$161552000		\$161,520.00	\$0.00	
_	Franklin	\$189,800.00		\$189,800.00	\$0.00	
	Randolph	\$152,000.00			\$152,000.00	
	Lafayette	\$107968.00			\$107,968.00	
	es Moines	\$61,600000			\$61,600.00	
IA P		\$72,480000			\$72,480.00	
WAC		\$420,992.00 \$470.000.00			\$420,992,000	
	Ciàliam	\$472,000.00			\$472,000.00	
	Thurston	\$100,800.000			\$100,800.00	
	<b>Ballahin</b>	(\$11 <b>6,000.00)</b>			\$0.00	
	Geneva	(\$350;915)00)		040.001	\$0.00	
NH (		\$140,000.000		\$40,381 .00	\$99(619.00 \$51.40© 00	
	Washington	\$70,000.00		\$18,894000 \$10,494.00	\$51,106.00	Stuimimarry/fy/9
NY 1		\$76,000.00 \$188.000.00		\$10,484.00	\$65,506.00	50 Funded <b>Project</b>
	Jeffersom damag	••			\$188,000.00	_
	dams	\$168,000.00		\$23,056.00	\$168,000.00	ΙL
	Bureau	\$192,000.00 \$135,1801.00		•	\$168,944.00	l A
	<b>Wadena</b> Morrison	: · · · · ·		\$135,180.00	\$0.00 <b>\$109,860.00</b>	ME
	Watonwan	\$109,860.00 \$78,980.00			\$78,960.00	
	Pipestone	\$78,980.00			\$78,980.00	MA
	Minona Minona	\$120,422.00			\$120,422.00	MI
		\$44,800,00			\$44,800.00	MN
IA U	Appanoose	\$65,584.00		\$66,584.00	\$0.00	MO
	<b>Appanoose</b> Crawford	\$63,200.00		400,J04.WJ	\$0.00 \$63,200.00	NH
					• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	
	<b>Audiien</b> Clinton	\$129,376.00 \$41.760.00			\$129,376.00 \$41.760.00	NJ
	Clinton Johnson	\$41,7600,00 \$123,520,00		\$122 E20 NA	\$41,760.00 \$0.00	NY
	Jonnson Hickory	\$123,520.00 \$112,690.00		\$123,520.00	\$0.00 \$112,690.00	0 R
					\$11 <b>2,580.00</b>	VA
	Nextord arbour (ail)	(\$81,3110.00) (\$493.280000)			\$0.00 \$0.00	WA
ALD	au Jour (all)	(\$493,280)00)				WV
	Oxford <b>(5Y92)</b>	\$117,993.00			<b>\$38</b> 6;393.00	

\$9,358,403-W

TOTAL

TN	ST COUNTY	NET ALLOCATION FY11994	ADO. ALLOC'S WITHBRAWALS SUBSEQ. YRS.	NETITOT. ALLOC.
1	OH Ashtathula	(\$288,000.00)		00.02
2	MNW <del>adiona</del> -	<b>(\$</b> \135,1 <b>80.00</b> )		\$i0i9
3	NIY St. baweence	\$8.00		<b>\$6.68</b>
4	ME Pleataguis	\$342,800.00	\$342 <del>(8</del> GCO)E	SA OVO
4	ME Penobscot	\$344,800.00		<b>\$344,866.68</b>
•	NJ Somerset	\$363,000.00		S360.000.W
6	RI Washington	\$0.00		\$6.00
7	Nittl Basos	\$180,666.00	\$10,58000	St <b>69,420.00</b>
8	MD Kaint	\$643,600.00		<b>S</b> \$403000.00
9	VA Tazewelli	\$259,1986000		<b>\$259,11888(DO</b>
9	<b>VA</b> Hampton	\$32,00000		\$52, <b>00</b> 000
		\$ t <b>76,000.00</b>		St <b>76,600.00</b>
		\$240,000.00		\$240,000.00
	***	\$160,000.00		OQ.QQQQQQQQQQ
	I L Grundy	\$4B8/200.00		<b>\$</b> 483, <b>200.00</b>
	IL Edgar	\$363,298.00		\$363,296.00
	MI LiMngst6h	\$30,1 t 200		\$90,111200
13		\$168,400100		\$168,490.00
	MNNSt bouie	\$374,460.00		\$374,400.00
	MN Watonwan	\$142,096.00	<b>A</b> A <b>A B CONTRACTOR</b>	St <b>42.096</b> 000
	A Howard	\$192,800.00	\$192,800,000	\$0.00
-	IA Page	\$76,490,000	\$76,400.00	SO.00
	IA Page	\$59,200.00	\$592200.UO	\$0.00
	MOlWamiteau	\$0.00	<b>A.196</b> steened	So.00
	MO Rušeski	\$472,400.00	\$472,4400000	so.00
	MO tastetie	\$0.00		SO.00
17		\$104,000.00		\$104,000.000
	WACIditam	\$268,000000		\$2588000.00
	WAINtenan	\$840;000,000		\$840,000000
	MI bikingsten (FY 92)	\$78,946.00		\$201,006.00
	ME/Accestock	(\$184,000.00)		\$0.00
	NY Tiloga	(\$10,494.00) (\$10.4.00)		\$65,506.70
21		(\$194.00)		\$227,806.00
24 25	NY Wyoming NJ Somerset	\$646,880.00		\$646,980.00
		\$260,0200,000		\$260,000,00
26 29		\$61,600.00		\$61,600.00
	IVA CONSOR	(\$33,230.00)		\$108;770.00
	MO Montgomery	(St <b>23,520(00)</b> )		\$0.00
		(\$161.520.00)		\$0.00
33	NY Washington  MORandolph	(\$18,894.00) \$326.400(00	\$200 400 HA	\$51,106.00
			\$326,400.VO	\$0.00
	MI Livingston VA Chasapakka	\$94,672 <b>00</b> \$286:060.00		\$94.672.00 \$266.000 TO
	AL Crenshaw	(\$23.430.00 <b>)</b>		\$266(0.80.00
	NY Delaware	(\$23,430.00) (\$41,020,00)		\$227,2240W0
39	IA I DAIGMOLD	(371.444.444)		\$11999,44677.00
	TOTAL	\$7,1041990000		

### SUMMARY FY 94

### 23 Funded Ethjects

68	t
IL IA	2 0
ME	t
MD	ť
MI	3
MN	2
MO	0
NH	t
NJ	2
NY	1
PA	1
VA	3
WA WV	2 3
44 A	ა

TN	S	ET COUNTRY	<b>NET</b> ALLOCATION <b>Pt 1995</b>	ADD. <b>ALLOC'S</b> <b>SUBSEQ.</b> YRS.	<b>WIFMORWWALS</b> <b>SUBSEQ.</b> YRS.	NETFROIT. ALLOC.
•		10 Pulaski	(\$4724000.100)			\$0.00
		VIO <b>Frianklin</b> :	(St <b>89,800.00)</b>			\$3a00
3W	1	L Bureau	(\$23, <b>@</b> 56. <b>V</b> 0)			\$1 <b>68;3%</b> #.000
		A Appanoose	<b>(\$66,584.700)</b>			<b>\$</b> 8.6
		A Howard	(\$1 92 <b>,80</b> 0000)			\$0.00
4W	/ I	IA Page	<b>(\$135,600:00)</b>			\$0.00
1	N	AO Pulaski	<b>\$1,000,000.00</b>			\$1,,000,000.00
1	N	<b>#10</b> Randidiph	\$0.00			<b>\$</b> Q₃ <b>60</b>
1	V	10 Crawfordi	SO.00			\$0.00
2	W	VV Wyoming	\$360,000.00			\$380,000,00
2	W	VV Ritchie	\$0.00			\$0.00
2	W	VV Lewis	\$260,000.00			\$260,000,00
2	٧	WV Raibiáh	s244,000.w			\$248,000,00
2		VV <b>Minneli</b>	s366.ao.w		\$368,400.00	SO.00
2	W	W Ritchle	\$208,000,00		\$208,000.00	\$0.00
3	Ň	Al Maceimib	\$118300.00			\$118,800,00
3	N	// Affortan	\$233,600,000			\$233,600.00
3	N	/   Montesin	\$127.760.00			\$127.758@00
3	N	// Schoolcraf	\$698,080.00			\$4983380000
3		// Crawford	. St 26.720.00			\$126.720.00
4		lly Jeffersort	\$6229960100			\$622,960,00
4		VY Steuben	\$300,000,00			\$300.000000
4		IY Liivingstori	\$385,280.00			\$395,290.00
4		IY Greene	\$249.600000			\$249,600.00
5		A Allegany	\$21 <b>6.400 66</b>			\$210,400,00
5		/A Stafford	\$52,000,000			S52.0W.w
6	_	AN INITIALISM	\$226,320000			\$226.320000
6		Aini Kanatiac	\$159,200,00			\$11599220400
6		//N Siblev	\$98,720.00			\$96,720.00
6		//N Sharburne	\$1 03.920 (90)			St 03.920.60
7		NJ Passaic	SO.00			SO.00
7		NJ <b>Hunte@lon</b>	\$206.448.00		\$44.296.00	\$165.158.00
7		J Somerset	\$280.000000		\$83,722.00	S t <b>96.278.00</b>
7		NJ Somerset	\$280.000.00		750, 1 22.00	\$280,000.00
8	-	L Bureau	\$201,344.00			\$201,344.00
8		L Cáthoun	\$41.6000.000			\$41,600,00
8		L Morgan	s96.0w.w			\$98,000.W
-		t Lee	\$55,440.000			\$55.440.00
9	-	A E Y Corik	\$232(000.00			\$232\000\00
9		AESomeraat	\$320,000.00			\$320,000.00
_		iii: 30meree. iii: Coos	\$132,000.00			\$320,000.00 \$132.000.00
		in Coos iii Coos	\$192,000.00			\$132,000,00
		Æ PikcalQtið	(9342,800,00)			92,000.00
		<b>MCRandolph</b>	(\$326,400,00)			\$0.00 \$0.00
		iidiidees	(\$326,40010) (\$10) <b>98</b> 00 <b>0</b> 0)			St 69.420.00
		TOTAL	\$6,228,572.00			

### SUMMARY SY 95: 30 Funded Projects

IL	4
ME	2
MI	5
MN	4
MO	1
NH	2
NJ	3
NY	4
VA	2
WV	3

### HIGHWAY BRIDGE REPLACEMENT AND REHABILITATION PROGRAM TIMBER BRIDGE CONSTRUCTION GRANT PROGRAM EXHIBIT 1-118 TBCGP96

TN	ST	COUNTY	NET ALLOCATION FY 1996	ADD. ALLOC'S SUBSEQ. YRS.	S	UBSEQ. YRS.	NET TOT. ALLOC.
1	AZ	YYuma	s89,000.w	<del>-</del>			s69,ow.w
2		Pitkin	\$72.816.00				\$72.816.DU
		Pitkin	\$88448.00				\$88,448.90
		Sideblok	S340.000.W				\$340,300.00
		cook	\$470.000.00				\$470,000.00
4	ΙL	Láke	\$70.006.000				\$7/0.006.000
		Bureau	\$201.344.00				\$201,344.00
-		Vermilion	\$447,600,00				\$447.600000
		Union	s256,0w.w				s256.Wo.w
5	IA	Buchanan	60,600,002				000,000,0022
6	KS	Miami	\$210,824.00				\$210.824.00
6	KS	Brown	\$114,400,000				El <b>14,400.00</b>
6	KS	Dickinson	\$122,640.00				\$122,640.00
		Osborne	\$180,000.00				\$180,000000
7	ME	Franklin	\$200,000.00				\$200,000.00
7		Oxford	\$200,000,00				\$200,000.00.
8		Neone	\$270,400,00				\$270,400.00
8	ΜI	Altona	\$205,600.00				\$205,800.000
8	ΜI	Livingston	\$169;880.00				\$159,520.00
8		Muskegon	\$172,800.00				\$172,806.00
9	MN	l Todd	\$1 <b>Q8.o</b> w.w				\$196,00000
9	ΜN	Fillmore	\$500,000,00				\$500,000.00
9	ΜN	Missillet	\$324,920.00				\$324,920.00
9	MN	Meatin	<b>\$30</b> 64 <b>0</b> 0 <b>0.10</b> 0				<b>\$308,8400.00</b>
10	NJ	Somerset	s464,0w.w				w64,wo.w
10	ΝJ	Somerset	\$566,666.00				\$500,666.60
10	ΝJ	Sommerset	\$308,000.00				\$30 <b>8</b> .000.00
11	NY	Casyugia	\$325,680.00				\$325,680,000
11	NY	Niagara	<b>\$480,000.00</b>				\$430,066.00
17	NY	Tioga	\$387,925100	+			\$367,925.00
ti	ΝY	Oneida	\$500,000.00				\$500,000.00
		Centire	\$308,800.00				\$308,800.00
		Chesapedine	\$273,819.00				\$273,819.00
		/ Min <b>eral</b> i	s148,wo.w				\$148,0 <b>00.00</b>
		/Kanawha	\$146,400.00				\$148,400.00
		/ Taylor	St <b>47,200.00</b>				St 47,200.00
		/Procedingolas	\$153,600.000				\$153, <b>60</b> 0.00
		/ Mineral	(\$386, <b>400</b> 0 <b>0</b> 0)				\$0.06
		/ Ritchie	(\$200 <del>0</del> 0.00)				\$0.60
		Coos	(\$7,15%.00)				\$99,619.00
17	PA	Centre	(\$308.800.00)				SO.00
		TOTAL	\$8,91 t ,791.6 <del>0</del>				

SUMMARY FY 96

### 36 Fündade Citients

ΑZ 2 СО 1 DE 5 IL IA KS 4 2 4 4 ΜE MI MN 3 NJ NY PA 0 VA WV 1

### HIGHWAY BRIDGE REPLACEMENT AND REHABILITATION PROGRAM ACCELERATION OF BRIDGE PROJECTS

#### **EXHIBIT** 1-19

<u>Fundi</u>	<u>ng - Initial 2</u>	<b>Bridges</b>	
V 70	set-aside <b>(P</b> .	T 95/199)	

FY 79 set-aside **(P.L.** 95499)

FY 81 set-aside **(P.L.** 96406)

\$ 54,000,000.00

145,826,000.00

\$1999,82265,0000.00

Deducts **from** initial finding

FY 86 set-aside **(P.L.** 99-272) **\$65,000,000.00** 1986 HBRRP apportionment **33,000,000.00** 

\$98,000,000.00

Balance of N 79 & FY 81 set-asides -98,000,000.00

\$101,826,000.00

Funds allocated (through Sentember 30, 1996)

Portsmouth Bridge \$50,692,196.76 East Huntington Bridge \$50,692,196.76

**\$96,026,3**11.76 **-96,026,3**11.76

Unallocated balance \$ 5,799,688.24

(both bridges are complete and open to traffic)

Reprogrammed(1/112/93) - 750,000.00

Unallocated sub-balance \$5,049,688.24

Funding - Additional 3 Bridges

FY 86 set-aside **(P.L.** 99-272) **\$ 65,000,000**.**00** 

Funds allocated (Mirough September 30, 1996)

 Central Bridge
 \$333,976,400.00

 Suspension Bridge
 864,000.00

 Maysville Bridge
 0.00

\$\$34,8340,400.00 -34,840,400.00

 unallocatecsub-balarice
 \$30,159,600.00

 Balance
 \$35,209,288.24

E- 26

## NATIONAL **BRIDGE** INVENTORY NATIONAL **BRIDGE INSPECTION STANDARDS EXHIBIT 2-1**

### CFR 23 **HIGHWAYS** - PART 650, SUBPART C - NATIONAL BRIDGE INSPECTION STANDARDS

### 650.301 Application of Standards

Pertains to all structures on public roads.

Provides definition of "bridge".

#### 650. 303 **InsDection** Procedures

- a. Each highway department shall include a bridge inspection program.
- b. Bridge inspectors shall meet the minimum qualifications stated in 650. 307.
- **c.** Each bridge shall be rated as to its **safe** load carrying capacity. Each bridge not meeting certain criteria must be posted.
- d. Inspection records and inventories shall be prepared and maintained.
- e. The individual in charge must maintain a master list of information pertaining to the following features:
  - 1. Fracture critical members.
  - 2. **Underwatter** members.
  - 3. Other special features.
  - 4. The date of last inspection of these features and a description of the findings and follow-up actions, **ifinecessary**.

### 650.305 Frequency of Inspections

- a. Each bridge is to be inspected at regular intervals not to exceed 2 years.
- b. Certain types or groups of bridges will require inspections at less than 2 year intervals.
- c. The maximum inspection interval may be increased for certain types of groups of bridges.

#### 650.3 07 Orbiffications of Personnel

- a. The individual in charge of the organizational unit shall:
  - 1. Be a registered P.E. or
  - 2. Be **qualified** for registration as a P.E. in that State or
  - **3. Haveamiriim**urn 10 years in bridge inspection experience and have completed a comprehensive training course.
- b. The individual in charge of the bridge inspection team shall:
  - 1. (a) above or
  - 2. Have a minimum 5 years in bridge inspection experience and have completed a comprehensive training course or
  - 3. Current certification as a Level III or IV Bridge **Safety** Inspector under the National Institute for Certification in Engineering Technologies.

#### 650.309 Inspection Report

The findings and results of bridge inspections shall be recorded on standard forms.

#### 650. 3 11 Inventory

- a. Each State shall prepare and maintain an inventory of all bridges.
- b. New or modified important data should be entered into the inventory within 90 days for State bridges and within 180 days for other bridges.

### EXHIBIT 2-2

### U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION FEDERAL HIGHWAY ASSISTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION

### INSPECTION FREQUENCY NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM

AS OF JUNE 30, 1996

COLUMN2 = GREGATIR THAN 2 YEARS = BEFORE 04/00/994

COLUMN3 = GREATIRR THAN 3 YEARS = BEFORE 04/00/993

COLUMN 4 = 2-YEAR PERIOD = 04/00/994 TO 03/81/96

COLUMN5 = 3-YEAR PERIOD = 04/01/93 TO 03/31/96

### TOTAL NUMBER OF BRIDGES

	IN INVENTORY	190>2 YK	190 > 3 MB	190<2.YR	I90<3 YR
AT ADAMA					
ALABAMA	2,812	133	5	2,679	2,807
ALASKA	245	0	0	245	245
ARIZONA	2,727	642	269	1,930	2,303
ARKANSAS	2,207	358	66	1,849	2,141
CALIFORNIA	9,622	1,379	311	<b>7,0 i8</b>	8,136
COLORADO	2,273	59	1	2,214	2,272
CONNECTICUT	1,752	196	0	1,556	1,752
DELAWARE	296	39	14	257	282
DIST. OF COL.	167	91	27	76	140
FLORIDA	4,823	176	1	4,645	4,820
GEORGIA	2,799	50	0	2,749	2,799
HAWAII	441	139	13	302	428
MDAHO	819	40	2	779	817
ILLINOIS	4,290	257	4	4,027	4,280
INDIANA	3,232	105	3	3,106	3,208
IOWA	2,142	400	73	1,705	2,032
KANSAS	2,709	188	24	2,521	2,685
KENTUCKY	2,035	135	3	1,930	2,032
LOUISIANA	2,669	163	49	2,495	2,609
MAINE	493	1	1	492	492
MARYLAND	1,715	170	8	1,197	1,359
MASSACHUSETTS	2,265	82	8	2,182	2,256
MICHIGAN	2,710	96	27	2,614	2,683
MINNESOTA	1,841	1	0	1,795	1,796
MISSIS <del>S</del> IPPI	2,292	97	13	2,195	2,279
MISSOURI	2,579	19	0	2,560	2,579
MONTANA	1,306	679	276	627	1,030
NEBRASKA	1,422	111	2	1,311	1,420
NEVADA	676	5	0	671	676
NEWHAANPSHIRE	659	11	0	6 <b>48</b>	659
NEW JERSEY	1.76 del	284	11	2,357	2,630
NEW MEXICO	1,659	333	80	1,326	1,579
NEW YORK	4,705	418	0	4,265	4,683
NORTH CAROLINA	2,689	234	1	2,455	2,688
NORTH DAKOTA	606	0	0	4.85	485
ОНІО	5,007	67	4	4,877	4,940
OKLAHOMA	3,117	250	6	2,866	3,110
OREGON	1,861	97	2	1,761	1,856
PENNSYLVANIA	5,315	43	6	5,271	5,308
RHODE ISLAND	368	20	0	346	366
SOUTH CAROLINA	1,419	234	5	1,185	1,414
SOUTH DAKOTA	922	129	10	793	912
TENNESSEE	3,671	407	1	3, <b>164</b>	3,670
TEXAS	1,4967	3,155	578	11,811	14,388
UTAH	1,041	1	1	1.040	1,0/40
VERMONT	484	1	0	483	484
VIRGINIA	3,031	186	1	2,839	3,024
WASHINGTON	2,291	77	1	1,778	1,854
WESTWINGINA	1,029	70	1	959	1,028
WISCONSIN	2,971	53	3	2,904	2,954
WYOMING	1,215	671	0	544	1,215
PUERTO RICO	706	38	1	664	701
TOTAL	127,736	12,590	1,912	112,668	123,346

### EXIMIBIT 2-3

## U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION FEDERAL HIGHWAY ASSISTED FRATION

#### INSPECTION FREQUENCY OTHER FEDERAL AID HIGHWAYS AS OF JUNE 30,11996

COLUMN 2 = GREATRTHAN 2 YEARS = BEFORE 04/00/994 COLUMN 3 = GREATER THAN 3 YEARS = BEFORE 04/00/993 COLUMN 4 = 2-YEAR PERIOD = 04/00/993 TO 03/30/996 COLUMN 5 = 3-YEAR PERIOD = 04/00/993 TO 03/30/996

## TOTAL NUMBER OF BRIDGES

	IN INVENTORY	190>2 YR	190>3 YR	.100n<2_YR	1900<3 YR
ALABAMA	5,042	230	57	4,812	4,985
ALASKA	441	3	1	438	440
ARIZONA	2,245	604	225	1.603	1,982
ARKANSAS	5,486	613	217	4,873	5,269
CALIFORNIA	6,706	895	177	5,115	5,833
COLORADO	1,909	102	2	1,807	1,907
CONNECTIGUT	1,131	110	2	1,021	1,129
DELAWARE	240	8	5	232	235
DIST., OF COL.	34	18	5	16	29
FLORIDA	2,570	100	2	2,461	2,559
GEORGIA	5,527	108	Õ	5.419	5,527
HAWAII	369	91	4	278	365
IDAHO	1.092	52	0	1.040	1,092
MLLINOUS	6,966	750	19	6,211	6,942
INDIANA	4,459	200	26	4,254	4,428
IOWA	5,171	715	97	4,318	4,936
KANSAS	8,425	1,338	144	7,087	8,281
KENTUCKY	3,252	293	6	2,959	3,246
LOUISIANA	3,698	169	6	2,539 3,527	3,690
MAINE	794	1	0	791	792
MARYLAND	1,035	24	5	819	838
MASSACHUSETTS	1,562	34	1	1,528	1,561
MICHIGAN	3,863	494	16	3,369	3,847
MINNESOTA	3,715	6	3	3,636	3,639
MISSISSIPRI	4,991	1,142	26	3,849	4,965
MISSOURI	6,588	231	20 7	6,350	6,574
MONTANA	1,213	410	65	801	1.146
NEBRASKA	3,826	244	2	3,582	3,824
NEVADA	296	4	0	291	295
NEWHAMPSHIRE	534	2	0	532	534
NEW JERSEY	1,905	192	8	1,713	1,897
NEW MEXICO	1,052	171	35	881	1,017
NEW YORK	4,668	202	0	4,442	4,644
NORTH CAROLINA	3,586	194	3	3,392	3,583
NORTH DAKOTA	1,156	0	0	1,057	1,057
OHIO	6,990	110	31	6,772	6,851
OKLAHOMA	8,868	598	9	8,268	8,857
OREGON	2,441	87	13	2,338	2,412
PENNSYLVANIA	6,147	89	1	6,058	6,146
RHODE ISLAND	241	10	0	231	241
SOUTH CAROLINA	3,202	277	11	2,924	3,190
SOUTH DAKOTA	1,811	177	36	1,634	1,775
TENNESSEE	5,607	425	0	5,181	5,606
TEXAS	14,972	3.126	776	11,841	14,191
UTAH	637	4	i	633	636
VERMONT	838	0	Ô	838	838
VERMONT	4,145	183	2	3,958	4,139
WASHINGTON	2,019	121	31	1,620	1,710
WEST-VIRGINIA	2,325	128	8	2,197	2,317
WISCONSIN	3,831	220	43	3,596	3,773
WISCONDING	732	182	0	55 <b>0</b>	732
PUERTO RICO	603	63	0	539	602
I JIMIO MICO	<del>000</del>	30	v	000	002
TOTAL	170,956	15,550	2,128	153,682	167,104

## U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMENIATE A DISW

#### INSPECTION FREQUENCY NON FEDERAL AID HIGHWAYS AS OF JUNE 30, 1996

COLUMN 2 = GREATER THAN 2 YEARS = BEFORE 04/01/94 COLUMN 3 = GREATER THAN 3 YEARS = BEFORE 04/01/93

COLUMN 4 = 2-YEAR PERIOD = 04/01/94 TO 03/31/96

COLUMN 5 = 3-YEAR PERIOD = 04/01/923 TO 03/3 1/96

## TOTALNUMBER OF BRIDGES

	OF BRIDGES				
	IN INVENTORY	<u>190&gt;2 YR.</u>	190033 YR	Mik2 YR	190 < 3 YR
ALABAMA	7,604	563	240	7,041	7,364
ALASKA	651	316	309	311	318
ARIZONA	1.510	192	78	1.266	1.380
ARKANSAS	4.777	118	26	4,659	4,751
CALIFORNIA	6,877	898	150	5,374	6,122
COLORADO	3,586	419	24	3,167	3,562
CONNECTIGIT	1,248	124	2	1,124	1,246
DELAWARE	274	15	$ ilde{7}$	259	267
DIST. OF COL.	46	10	3	36	43
FLORIDA	3.509	90	23	3,412	3,479
GEORGIA	5,992	99	0	5.893	5.992
HAWAII	245	67	6	178	239
IDAHO	2,221	203	9	2,017	
ILLINOIS	•		27	,	2,211
INDXANA	13,834	1,954	213	11,875	13,802
	10,151	1,321	213 160	8,830	9,938
IOWA	17,900	2,414		14,991	17,245
KANSAS	14,691	2,054	106	12,636	14,584
KENTUCKY	7,857	501	17	7,356	7,840
LOUISIANA	6,983	539	23	6,441	6,957
MAINE	1,056	4	1	1,052	1,055
MARYLAND	2,023	80	33	1,867	1,914
MASSACHIUSETTES	1,181	31	10	1,150	1,171
MICHIGAN	4,045	519	6	3,523	4,036
MINNESOTA	7,125	24	19	6,929	6,934
MISSISSIPPI	9,318	3,512	20	5,805	9,297
MISSOURI	13,850	5,535	39	<b>8,3</b> 13	13,809
MONTANA	2,443	641	84	1,790	2,347
NEBRASKA	10,344	47	0	10,295	10,342
NEVADA	236	7	0	229	236
NEWHAANEBSHIRE	1,140	67	41	1,073	1,099
NEW JERSEY	1,703	118	38	1,585	1,665
NEW MEXICO	887	99	13	788	874
NEW YORK	7,988	132	2	7,830	7,960
NORTH CAROLINA	10,011	517	13	9,494	9,998
NORTH DAKOTA	2.825	7	7	2,683	2,683
ОНІО	15,771	281	151	15,225	15,355
OKLAHOMA	10,719	1,006	11	9,711	10,706
OREGON	2,977	385	173	2,580	2,792
. PENNSYLVANIA	10,780	323	25	10,457	10,755
RHODE ISLAND	125	3	0	122	125
SOUTH CAROLINA	4,363	48	10	<b>4,3</b> 15	4,353
SOUTH DAKOTA	3.348	28	6	3,320	3,342
TENNESSEE	9,554	720	4	8,833	9,549
TEXAS	17,257	4.116	315	13,137	16,938
UTAH	1,008	28	6	979	1,001
VERMONT	1,372	43	43	1,329	1,329
				· ·	,
VIRGINIA . WASHINGTON	5,437 3,077	171 329	5 119	5,265	5,431 2.7721
	- / -	329 240		2,521	<b>2,73</b> 1
WESTVIRGINIA	3,224		18	2,984	3,206
WISCONSIN	6,418	406	20	5,968	6,354
WYOMING	1,032	92 71	2	939	1,029
PUERTO RICO	577	71	3	506	574
	902 170	91 597	9 660	940 469	970 990
	283,170	31,527	2,660	249,463	278,330

## US. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION FEDERALHIGHWAY AS MONISTRATION

# COUNT OF DEFICIENT BRIDGES BY STATE NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM AS OF JUNE 30, 1996

	TOTAL NUMBER				
	OF BRIDGES	NON-DEFICIENT	STRUCTURALLY	FUNCTIONALLY	DEFICIENT
	IN INVENTORY	BRIDGES	DEFICIENT	OBSOLETE	BRIDGES
ALABAMA	2,812	2,025	110	677	787
ALASKA	245	194	24	27	51
ARIZONYA	2,727	2,465	49	211	260
ARKANSAS	2,207	1,766	89	352	441
CALIFORNIA	9,622	7,012	249	2,361.	2,610
COLORADO	2,273	1,738	126	409	535
CONNECTIGUT	1,752	1,321	113	318	431
DELAWARE	296	225	21	50	71
DIST. OF COL.	167	71	29	67	96
FLORIDA	4,823	3,729	37	1,057	1,094
GEORGIA	2,799	2,266	68	465	533
HAWAII	441	218	20	203	223
IDAHO	819	623	31	165	196
ILLINOIS	4,290	3,132	476	682	1,158
ENIDIANA	3,232	2,657	88	487	575
IOWA	2,142	1,630	70	442	512
KANSAS	2,709	2,048	129	532	661
KENTUGKY	2,035	1,656	39	340	379
LOUISIANA	2,669	1,946	145	578	723
MAINE	493	359	38	96	134
MARYLAND	1,715	1,312	82	321	403
<b>MASSACHIUSE</b> ITES	2,265	931	192	1,142	1,334
MICHIGAN	2,710	1,762	527	421	948
MINNESOTA	1,841	1,614	125	102	227
MISSISSIPPI	2,292	1,556	96	640	736
MISSOURI	2,579	1,909	192	478	670
MONTANA	1,306	956	22	328	350
NEBRASKA	1,422	1,238	110	74	184
NEVADA	676	501	13	162	175
NEWHAAMPSHIRE	659	510	49	100	149
NEWJIERSEY	2,644	1,740	371	533	904
NEW MEXICO	1,659	1,424	69	<b>166</b> ,	235
NEW YORK	4,705	1,900	2,161	644	2,805
NORTH CAROLINA	2,689	1,924	282	483	765
NORTH DAKOTA	606	556	17	33	50
ОНІО	5,007	3,702	421	884	1,305
OKLAHOMA	3,117	2,473	277	367	644
OREGON	1,861	1,280	50	531	581
PENNSYLVANIA	5,315	3,533	833	949	1,782
RHODE ISLAND	368	207	72	89	161
SOUTH CAROLINA	1,419	1,115	39	265	304
SOUTH DAKOTA	922	753	72	37	169
TENNESSEE	3,671	2,786	184	701	885
TEXAS	14,967	12,421	481	2,065	2,546
UTAH	1,041	688	102	251	353
VERMONT	484	335	21	128	149
VIRGINIA	3,031	2,426	166	439	605
WASHINGTON	<b>2,29</b> 1	1,540	151	600	751
WESTWIRGINIA	1,029	685	171	173	344
WISCONSIN	2,971	2,534	287	150	437
WYOMING	1,215	964	36	217	253
PUERTO RICO	706	460	68	178	246
	127,736	94,816	9,690	23,230	32,920

## U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION FEDERAL HIGHWAY ASSESSMENT TRANSPORT

# COUNT OF DEFICIENT BRIDGES BY **STATE**OTHER **FEDGER** ALD HIGHWAYS AS OF **JUNE 30**,11996

	TOTAL NUMBER				
	OF BRIDGES	NON-DEFICIENT	SER HIGHTINIATY	<b>FUNCI'IONALLY</b>	DEFICIENT
	IN INVENTORY	BRIDGES	DEFICIENT	OBSOLETE	BRIDGES
ALABAMA	5,042	3,647	692	703	1,395
ALASKA	441	359	40	42	82
ARIZONA	2,245	2.047	71	127	198
ARKANSAS	5,486	4,426	466	594	1,060
CALIFORNIA	6,706	4,983	433	1,289	1,722
COLORADO	1,909	1,582	148	179	327
CONNECTICAT	1,131	766	113	252	365
DELAWARE	240	193	20	27	47
DIST. OF COL.	34	12	7	15	22
FLORIDA	2,570	1,810	72	688	760
GEORGIA	5,527	4,176	515	836	1,351
HAWAM	369	170	72	127	199
IDAHO	1,092	900	67	125	192
ILLINOIS	6,966	5,423	877	666	1,543
INDIANA	4,459	3,486	438	535	973
IOWA	5,171	4,093	517	561	1,078
KANSAS	8,425	7,062	558	805	1,363
KENTUCKY	3,252	2,053	198	1,001	1,199
LOUISIANA	3,698	2,386	621	691	1,312
MAINE	794	483	100	211	311
MARYLAND	1,035	700	104	231	335
MASSACHUSETTES	1,562	662	280	620	900
MICHIGAN	3,863	2,609	691	563	1,254
MINNESOTA	3,715	3,176	386	153	539
MISSISSIPPI	4,991	3,650	944	397	1,341
MISSOURI	6,588	4,179	1,495	914	2,409
MONTANA	1,213	1,021	77	115	192
NHERASKA	3,826	3,297	340	189	529
NEVADA	296	264	13	19	32
NEWIHAMPSHIRE	534	352	86	96	182
NEW JERSEY	1,905	930	451	5 <b>24</b>	975
NEW MEXICO	1,052	888	87	77	164
NEW YORK	4,668	1,964	2,253	451	2,704
NORTH CAROLINA	3,586	2,324	582	680	1,262
NORTH DAKOTA	1,156	1,060	61	35	96
OHIO	6,990	5,196	953	841	1,794
OKLAHOMA	8,868	6,302	1,959	607	2,566
OREGON	2,441	1, <b>86</b> 3	157	421	2,300 578
PENNSYLVANIA	6,147	3,288	1,776	1,083	2,859
RHODE ISLAND	241	120	56	65	2,839 121
SOUTH CAROLINA	3,202	2,459	254	489	743
SOUTH DAKOTA	1,811	1,642	117	52	169
TENNESSEE	5,607	4,057	507	1.043	1,550
TEXAS	14,972	12,114	7 <b>0</b> 7	2,151	2,858
UTAH	637	513	65	59	124
VERMONT	838	495	169	174	343
VIRGINIA	4,145	2,740	464	941	1,405
WASHINGTON	2,019	2,740 1,378	143	498	1,405 641
WESTVIRGINIA	2,019 2,325	1,189	588	548	
WISCONSIN		2,995			1,136
WISCONSIN	3,831	2,995 <b>644</b>	641 65	195 24	836 89
PUERTO RICO	732 603	206	65 101	24 296	397
I DENIU MICU	UUJ	₩UU	101	ผยป	397
TOTAL	170,956	124,334	22,597	24,025	46,622

## EXEUBIT 2-7

# U.S. DEPARTMENT OF **TRANSPORTATION** FEDERAL HIGHWAY **ADMINISTRATION**

# COUNT OF DEFICIENT BRIDGES BY **STATE**NON **FEDERAL**. AID HIGHWAYS AS OF JUNE **30**,11996

	TOTALNUMBER				
	OF BRIDGES	NON-DEFICIENT	STRUCTURALLY	FUNCTIONALLY	DEFICIENT
	IN INVENTORY	BRIDGES	DEFICIENT	OBSOLETE	BRIDGES
ALABAMA	7,604	4,778	2,003	823	2,826
ALASKA	651	409	2,003 <b>77</b>	165	242
ARIZONA	1,510	1,267	103	138	241
ARKANSAS	4,777	2,697	1,367	713	2,080
CALIFORNIA	6,877	4,952	799	1,126	2,080 1,925
COLORIADO	3,586	2,793	485	308	1,923 793
CONNECTIGUT	1,248	838	187	223	410
DEMAWARE	274	219	34	21	55
DIST. OF COL.	46	13	4	29	33
FLORIDA	3,509	2,473	204	832	1,036
GEORGIA	5,992	4,042	1,511	439	,
HAWAII	245	127	43	439 75	1,950
IDAHO	2,221	1,779	259	75 183	118 442
ILLINOIS	13,834	10,626	2,231	977	
INDIANA	10,151	6,929	2,232	990	3,208
IOWA	17,900	•	·		3,222
KANSAS	17,900 <b>14,69</b> 1	11,891	4,094	1,915	6,009
		9,058	3,307	2,326	5,633
KENTUCKY	7,857	5,238	1,153	1,466	2,619
LOUISIANA	6,983	3,872	2,167	944	3,111
MAINE	1,056	628	217	211	428
MAR-	24023	1,275	281	467	748
MASSEACHUBETTS	1,181	588	255	338	593
MICHIGAN	4,045	2,636	1,025	384	1,409
MINNESOTA	7,125	5,574	1,126	425 .	1,551
MISSISSIPPI	9,318	4,983	3,794	541	4,335
MISSOURI	13,850	6,901	5,876	1,073	6,949
MONTANA	2,443	1,715	491	237	728
NEBRASKA	10,344	6,103	3,342	899	4,241
NEVADA	236	189	31	16	47
NEWHAMPSHIRE	1,140	623	275	242	517
NEW JERSEY	1,703	971	418	314	732
NEW <b>MEXICO</b>	887	607	123	157	280
NEW YORK	7,988	3,692	4,662	324	4,986
NORTH CAROLINA	10,011	6,248	2,252	1,511	3,763
NORTH DAKOTA	2,825	1,664	864	297	1,161
ОНІО	15,771	10,648	2,675	<b>2,448</b>	5,123
OKLAHOMA	10,719	4,694	<b>5,394</b>	631	6,025
OREGON	2,977	2,368	300	309	609
PENNSYLVANIA	10,780	5,789	<b>3,02</b> 3	1,968	4,991
RHODE ISLAND	125	51	40	34	74
SOUTH CAROLINA	4,363	3,458	751	154	905
SOUTH DAKOTA	3,348	2,043	963	342	1,305
TENNESSEE	9,554	6,958	1,529	1,067	2,596
TEXAS	17,257	16,181	3,399	2,677	6,076
UTAH	1,008	788	158	62	220
VERMONT	1,372	767	428	177	605
VIRGINIA	5,437	3,583	675	1,179	1,854
WASHINGTON	3,077	2,462	210	405	615
WESTWIRGINIA	3,224	1,717	<b>765</b>	742	1,507
WISCONSIN	6,418	4,887	1,271	260	1,531
WYOMING	1,032	642	284	108	392
PUERTO RICO	577	242	7 <b>4</b>	261	335
	<b></b>	~ IN		WUI	333
TOTAL	283,170	179,986	69,231	33,953	103,184

## U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION

#### STATUS OF BRIDGES APPROVED FOR THE BRIDGE PROGRAM

	Twelfith HBRR As of June 30				From National As of June 30,		tory	
	National	Other FA	Non FA		National	Other FA	Non FA	
Number of bridges inventoried	Hwy System 126,911	System 170,178	Highways 279,371	<u>Total</u> 576,460	Hwy System 127,736	System 170,956	Highways 283,170	<u>Total</u>
and classified	120,011	170,170	210,011	070,100	127,700	170,330	200,170	351,002
Number of Structurally deficient <b>bridges</b> (includes closed <b>b</b>	9,947	24,147	73,589	107,683	9,690	22,s 97	69,231	101,518
Number of functionally obsolete bridges <b>b</b> b	22,716	23,043	34,073	79,832	23,230	24,025	33,953	81,208
Number of bridges that are posted=	1,684	17,757	89,328	108,769	1,434	16,995	84,081	102,510
Additional bridges that should be posted $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}$	686	3,445	9,372	13,503	689	2,553	8,580	11,822
Total bridges that are or should be posted $\mathfrak E$	2,370	21,202	98,700	122,272	2,123	19,548	<b>92,66</b> 1	114,332
Number of bridges closed to all traffic (these bridges may be closed temporarily for repairs or closed permanently)	127	455	3,447	4,029	116	392	3,468	3,976
repairs of closed permissing))	Federal-Aid	Off System	Total		Federal-Aid	Off System	Total	
Total number of SBRP	1,578		1,578		1,578		1,578	
bridges füded HPRR under the bridge	P 23,257	18,550	41,807		26,335	21,503	47,838	
program * Total	24,835	18,550	43,385		27,913	21,503	49,416	
Number of replaced or rehabilitated bridges open to traffic (SBRP & HERRE)	17,034	12,820	29,854		19,442	14,569	34,011	
Bridges under construction and/or design (SBRP * HBRRRP)	7, <b>801</b>	5,730	13,531		8,471	6,934	15,405	

- A structurally deficient bridge, as defined by FHWA, is one that (1) has been restricted to light vehicles only, (2) is closed, or (3) requires immediate rehabilitation to remain open; a functionally obsolete bridge is one which the deck geometry, load tarrying capacity (comparison of the original design load to the current State legal load), clearance, or approach roadway alignment no longer meets the usual criteria for the system of which it is an integral part.
- b The number of deficient bridges (structurally deficient and functionally obsolete) reflects FHWA's interpretation of the States' inventory data for this program, and may not agree. with an individual State's records for these two categories. See Exhibits 2-4, 2-S and 2-6 for breakdown.
- Bridges that require posting include two groups: posting for load and posting for other load-capacity restriction (speed, number of vehicles on bridge, etc.). These groups include structurally deficient bridges that have deteriorated to the extent that they cannot carry the load for which they were designed and functionally obsolete bridges that are in good condition but the current State legal load exceeds the original load and, therefore, the bridges require posting. The number of bridges that are closed or posted or that should be posted but are not, is taken from the National Bridge Inventory as submitted by the States. See Exhiiits **Z-10**, **22411** and **2-12** for the breakdown by State.
- d These counts include only bridges funded with **HEZERP** and SBRP funds. Many bridge improvements are also made using other categories of Federal-aid highway funds and State or local funds. SBRP funded bridges completed using HBRRP funds are counted under HBRRP.

# EXHIBIT **2-9**DEFICIENT BRIDGES - COMPARISON

## National **Highway** System

Bridges In Inventory	FY 1992 122,911	<u>FY 1993</u> 124,184	<u>FY 1994</u> 126,911	<u>FY <b>1995</b></u> 127,263	<u>FY 1996</u> 127,736
Deficient Number Percent	<b>33,5</b> 19 27.3	33,117 26. 7	32, 663 25. 7	32,698 25. 7	3 2,920 25. 8
Other Federal-Aid I	Highways				
Bridges In Inventory	FY 1992 <b>174,89</b> 1	FY 1993 176,116	<u>FY 1994</u> 170,178	<u>FY 1995</u> 168,593	<u>FY 1996</u> 170,956
Deficient Number Percent	53, 161 30. 4	51,315 29.1	47, 190 27. 7	45,986 27.3	46,622 27.3
Non Federal-Aid Hi	ghway/s				
Bridges In Inventory	FY 1992 274,394	<u>FY 1993</u> 273, 444	<u>FY 1994</u> 279,371	<u>FY 1995</u> 285, 278	FY 1996 283,170
Deficient Number Percent	112,430 41.0	<b>107,831</b> 39.4	107,662 38. 5	106, 583 37. 4	103,184 36.4
TOTAL					
Bridges In Inventory	<u>FY 1992</u> 572, 196	FY 1993 573, 744	<u>FY 1994</u> 576, 460	<u>FY 1995</u> 581, 134	<u>FY <b>1996</b></u> 58 1,862
Deficient Number Percent	199,110 34. 8	192,263 33. 5	187, 515 32. 5	185, 267 31.9	182,726 31. 4

# U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION FEDERALHIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION

#### COUNT OF OPEN, CLOSED AND POSTED BRIDGES NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM AS OF JUNE 30, 11996

	TOTAL NUMBER	OPEN - NOT			OPEN - SHOULD
	OF <b>BRADGES</b>	REQUIRING	CLOSED	POSTED	BE POSTED BUT
	IN INVENTORY	POSTING	BRIDGES	BRIDGES	ARE NOT POSTED
ALABAMA	2,812	2,794	2	16	0
ALASKA	245	244	0	0	1
ARIZONA	2,727	2,717	1	4	5
ARKANSAS	2,207	2,183	0	21	3
CALIFORNIA	9,622	9,609	6	5	2
COLORADO	2,273	2,260	1	9	3
CONNECTIGIT	1,752	1,693	2	56	1
DELAWARE	296	284	0	12	0
DIST. OF COL.	167	148	2	8	9
FLORIDA	4,823	4,804	8	11	0
GEORGIA	2,799	2,789	1	9	0
HAIWAIII	441	441	0	0	0
IDAHO	819	814	1	3	1
ILLINOIS	4,290	4,267	6	14	3
INDIANA	3,232	3,222	1	9	0
IOWA	2,142	2,136	0	4	2
KANSAS	2,709	2,690	0	18	1
KENTUCKY	2,035	2,003	0	29	3
LOUISIANA	2,669	2,591	7	71	0
MAINE	493	491	0	1	1
MARYLAND	1,715	1,698	4	10	3
MASSACHIUSEIFIS	2,265	2,142	16	99	8
MICHIGAN	2,710	2,674	1	22	13
MINNESOTA	1,841	1,835	0	3	3
MISSISSIPPI	2,292	2,013	0	267	12
MISSOURI	2,579	2,228	1	347	3
MONTANA	1,306	1,305	0	1	0
NEBRASKA	1,422	1,394	4	4	20
NEVADA	676	675	0	0	1
NEWHAANISTHRE	659	657	2	0	0
NEW JERSEY	2,644	2,598	13	33	0
NEW MEXICO	1,659	1,659	0	0	0
NEW YORK	4,705	4,608	6	91	0
NORTH CAROLINA	2,689	2,670	0	19	0
NORTH DAKOTA	606	606	0	0	0
ОНІО	5,007	4,980	9	18	0
OKLAHOWA.	3,117	3,084	1	24	8
OREGON	1,861	1,850	1	6	4
PENNSYLVANIA	5,315	5,254	6	Sl	4
RHODE ISLAND	368	355	1	11	1
SOUTH CAROLINA	1,419	1,401	1	4	13
SOUTH DAKOTA	922	921	0	1	0
TENNESSEE	3,671	3,661	0	10	0
TEXAS	14,967	14,399	5	30	533
UTAH	1,041	1,040	0	1	0
VERMONT	484	483	0	1	0
VIRGINIA	3,031	3,011	0	19	1
WASHINGTON	2,291	2,269	1	12	9
WESTWIRGINIA	1,029	1,008	1	20	0
WISCONSIN	2,971	2,959	4	5	3
WYOMING	1,215	1,214	0	0	1
PUERTO RICO	706	666	1	25	14
	127,736	125,497	116	1,434	689
	161,130	163,437	110	1,434	ชอช

# U.S. DEPARTMENT OF **TRANSPORTATION**FEDERAL HIGHWAY **ADMINISTRATION**

# COUNT OF OPEN, CLOSED AND POSTED BRIDGES OTHERS FEDERAL AID HIGHWAYS AS OF JUNE 30, 1996

	TOTAL NUMBER	OPEN - NOT			OPEN - SHOULD
	OF BRIDGES	REQUIRING	CLOSED	POSTED	BE POSTED BUT
	IN INVENTORY	POSTING	BRIDGES	BRIDGES	ARE NOT POSTED
ALABAMA	5,042	4,363	26	652	1
ALASKA	441	395	2	33	11
ARIZONA	2,245	2,166	3	19	57
ARKANSAS	5,486	4,850	5	602	29
CALIFORNIA	6,706	6,629	10	67	0
COLORADO	1,909	1,784	0	92	33
CONNECTIGUT	1,131	1,095	3	33	0
DELAWARE	240	225	1	13	1
DIST. OF COL.	34	30	0	3	1
FLORIDA	2,570	2,106	1	459	4
GEORGIA	5,527	5,041	10	449	27
HAWAII	369	315	0	52	2
HDAHO	1,092	997	1	85	9
ILLINOIS	6,966	6,792	20	140	14
KNDIANA	4,459	4,106	10	339	4
IOWA	5,171	4,693	8	417	53
KANSAS	8,425	5,404	11	2,725	285
KENTUCKY	3,252	3,028	4	201	24
LOUISIANA	3,698	3,194	11	493	0
MAINE	794	775	0	17	2
MARYLAND	1,035	894	5	128	8
MASSACHUSEITIS	1,562	1,250	29	263	20
MICHIGAN	3,863	3,369	14	395	85
MXNNESOUA	3,715	3,618	3	85	9
MESSERSEPPE	4,991	3,491	9	1,157	334
MISSOURI	6,588	4,649	6	1,917	16
MONTANA	1,213	1,126	0	80	7
NEBRASKA	3,826	3.046	8	491	281
NEVADA	296	293	Ŏ	1	2
NEWHAMPSHIRE	534	515	3	16	0
NEW JERSEY	1,905	1,624	12	262	7
NEW MEXICO	1,052	1,019	0	20	13
NEW YORK	4,668	4,325	23	320	0
NORTH CAROLINA	3,586	3,080	0	505	1
NORTH DAKOTA	1,156	1,021	2	127	6
OHIO	6,990	6,701	8	258	23
OKLAHOMA	8,868	7,024	33	1.608	203
OREGON	2,441	2,307	0	95	39
PENNSYLVANIA	6,147	5,547	48	500	52
RHODE ISLAND	241	199	5	37	0
SOUTH CAROLINA	3,202	2,994	8	84	116
SOUTH DAKOTA	1,811	1,523	Ŏ	279	9
TENNESSEE	5,607	5,412	8	159	28
TEXAS	14,972	13,810	16	468	678
UTAH	637	607	0	28	2
VERMONT	838	822	Ŏ	16	0
VIRGINIA	4,145	3,823	9	310	3
WASHINGTON	2,019	1,911	2	90	16
WESTWIRGINIA	2,325	2,024	4	290	7
WISCONSIN	3,831	3,785	9	30	7
WYOMING	732	700	0	30	2
PUERTO RICO	603	524	2	55	22
<u> </u>					
	170,956	151,016	392	16,995	2,553
	,	- ,	<del></del>	,	,

# U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION

#### COUNT OF OPEN, CLOSED AND POSTED BRIDGES NON FEDERAL AID HIGHWAYS AS OF JUNE **30,1996**

	TOTAL NUMBER	ODEN NOT			ODEN CHOULD
	TOTALNUMBER	OPEN - NOT	GY COEP	DOCUMEN	OPEN - SHOULD
	OF BRIDGES	REQUIRING	CLOSED	POSTED	BE POSTED BUT
	IN INVENTORY	POSTING.	BRIDGES	BRIDGES	ARE NOT POSTED
ALABAMA	7,604	4,608	148	2,837	11
ALASKA	651	577	8	52	14
ARIZONA	1,510	1,295	12	87	116
ARKANSAS	4,777	<b>2,38</b> 1	25	2,186	185
CIALLIFORMIA	6,877	6,425	36	397	19
COLORADO	3,586	2,708	26	674	178
CONNECTICUT	1,248	1,124	15	106	3
DELAWARE	274	237	3	34	0
DIST. OF COL.	46	42	1	3	0
FLORIDA	3,509	1,988	37	1,425	59
GEORGIA	5,992	3,864	182	1,797	149
HAWAII	245	165	0	73	7
IDAHO	2,221	1,788	9	373	51
ILLINOIS	13,834	11,951	125	1,724	34
INDIANA	10,151	7,060	144	2,827	120
IOWA	17,900	11,039	160	6,291	410
KANSAS	<b>14,69</b> 1	6,953	234	6,720	784
KENTUCKY	7,857	6,429	55	1,055	318
LOUISIANA	6,983	3,697	110	3,170	6
MAINE	1,056	941	10	64	41
.MMIRRYIAAND	2,023	1,296	29	658	40
MASSACHUSEIITS	1,181	801	52	314	14
MICHIGAN	4,045	2,782	157	979	127
MENNISONA	7,125	<b>6,3</b> 15	43	737	30
MISSISSIPPI	9,318	4,408	154	3,231	1,525
MISSOURI	13,850	5,686	248	7,477	439
MONTANA	2,443	1,620	8	733	32
NEBRASKA	10,344	3,678	96	5,820	750
NEVADA	236	212	2	13	9
NEW-HIRE	1,140	825	28	231	56
NEWJERSEY	1,703	1,214	58	424	7
NEW MEXXICO	887	767	7	92	21
NEW YORK	7,988	6,155	141	1,691	1
NORTHCAROLXINA	10,011	5,510	0	4,482	19
NORTH DAKOTA	2,825	1,360	25	1,374	66
OHIO	15,771	12,219	99	3,260	193
OKLAHOMA	10,719	4,819	272	4,883	745
OREGON	2,977	2,616	9	277	75
PENNSYLVANIA	10,780	7,584	277	2,798	121
RHODE ISLAND	125	70	10	45	0
SOUTH CAROLINA	4,363	3,593	61	493	216
SOUTH DAKOTA	3,348	1,590	0	1,701	57
TENNESSEE	9,554	7,843	65	1,431	215
TEXAS	17,257	10,714	164	5,322	1,057
UTAH	1,008	755	8	221	24
VERMONT	1,372	1,151	14	166	41
WIRGINIA	5,437	3,911	14	1,495	17
WASHINGTON	3,077	2,825	12	211	29
WESTVIRGINIA	3,224	2,429	22	756	17
WISCONSIN	6,418	5,789	43	558	28
WYOMING	1,032	694	2	<b>254</b>	82
PUERTO RICO	577	538	8	9	22
I CLIVIO INICO					
TOTAL	283,170	187,041	3,468	84,081	8,580
	~~,,	,	-,	,	-,